Class 234.90 Book C791
General Theological Seminary Library
CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK

A

TREATISE

ON

PREDESTINATION, ELECTION, AND GRACE.

HISTORICAL, DOCTRINAL, AND PRACTICAL;

TO WHICH IS ADDED A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE SUBJECT.

BY

W. A. COPINGER, F.S.A.,

THE MIDDLE TEMPLE, ESQUIRE, BARRISTER-AT-LAW; AUTHOR OF "THE LAW OF COPYRIGHT IN WORKS OF LITERATURE AND ART"; "THOUGHTS ON HOLINESS"; &c.

"O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!"—*Rom. xi. 33.*

London:
JAMES NISBET & CO.,
21, BERNERS STREET.

1889.

25125

234.9 O
C791

TO

THE RIGHT REVEREND THE LORD BISHOP

AND THE CLERGY

OF THE

DIOCESE OF MANCHESTER

THIS WORK

IS

WITH EVERY SENTIMENT OF RESPECT

AND ADMIRATION

DEDICATED

BY

THE AUTHOR.

PREFACE.

No doctrine is taught in Holy Scripture upon which men have been more divided in opinion than the doctrine of Predestination and Election. Many hold the doctrine in such a way that they find it inconsistent with certain parts of Scripture, and it is clear, therefore, that they cannot hold the doctrine aright, for no part of God's word can actually be inconsistent, however it may appear to be, with any other part. Every part of it is equally true. One part throws light on and is as it were a key to unlock other parts. No particular part of the Bible is the ground of our faith and the rule of our life. It is the Word of God as a whole. We are instructed to compare Scripture with Scripture and search out "all the counsel of God" (Acts xx. 27), so far as it is revealed, if we wish to become "wise unto salvation."

In the 17th Article it is truly stated that "the godly consideration of Predestination and our Election in Christ is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort." And yet how few know anything whatever respecting this "sweet, pleasant, and unspeakably" comforting doctrine. Many think it is above their investigation and would lead them to pry too curiously into the depth of theology.

The doctrine surely is not revealed to us in Holy Scripture that it may be lightly considered or not con-

sidered at all. To imagine that a belief in a doctrine revealed in Holy Scripture can be otherwise than productive of real good to the child of God, is little less than a reflection on Divine wisdom. "Every Scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness; that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work." And the doctrine we are about to consider will be found on the one hand very full of comfort to those who love God and walk in his holy ways, and, on the other hand, full of rebuke, warning, and admonition to those who resist His Will and obey not the Gospel of His Son.

It is said, however, that Predestination is a mystery, better left alone and not enquired into, as it is alleged that subjects such as this, are full of nice, subtil, and profitless speculation, and that no good can result from attempting to pry into the secrets of God.

Both these allegations are true, but the attaching them necessarily to the subject we are about to consider is an error arising from ignorance. True, the subject may lead to subtil and profitless speculation if great care be not exercised and no rein be put upon the imagination, and besides, there is always the danger of going too far—passing beyond the analogy of the faith, and presumptuously attempting to lay open the secret things of God.

But are we to be deterred from ascending the Mount of God on account of the difficulty of climbing, and the danger which the many precipices present? God would have His people to search into His way of acting, that they may thus learn more of His mind and His blessed purposes. He appeals to them directly in some

cases, Isaiah v. 3-4; Ezekiel xviii. 25-29; Matt. xxi. 40, 46; Luke xii. 56, 57.

The Almighty, who alone knows what is best suited to the condition of His creatures, has not thought fit in His wisdom to communicate the knowledge of Divine things to them in one broad uniform current of information. That which is essential to salvation He has conveyed in terms clear and explicit, but that which is not, is only touched on lightly and indirectly. That a knowledge of the Scripture doctrine of Predestination is helpful to us in our life of faith and our growth in holiness is true, but that it is absolutely necessary to the exercise of faith or to the advancement in holiness is not true, for we may often understand the terms of a proposition—fully assent to a doctrine—without a clear apprehension of all that is included in it; nay, is it not the fact that we may even be able to prove and defend a doctrine without being competent to explain it in detail or realize all the consequences which flow from it? On the subject of Predestination we find nothing in Holy Scripture like the exactness of a logical method or the subtilties of metaphysical distinctions. The inspired writers display no solicitude about rigorous definitions or refined reasoning, they declare in simple language the great truth—entering into no defence of the mercy or justice of God, making no attempt to reduce Divine revelation within the scanty grasp of finite understandings. The Holy Ghost was given to guide us into all truth, and the investigations of faith, and the meditation and enlightenment of holy men in past ages cannot be regarded as nought. Predestination, like most other doctrines, has been developed in the process of time. As Dr. Newman says, "No one

doctrine can be named which starts complete at first and gains nothing afterwards from the investigations of faith and the attacks of heresy. The Church went forth from the old world in haste, as the Israelites from Egypt, with their dough before it was leavened, their kneading troughs being bound up in their cloths upon their shoulders." [1]

Probably the majority of those who complain that the subject is too speculative to be of practical value, and who decry so loudly anything which has the appearance of what they describe as prying into the secrets of God, are those who are dull of understanding and uninterested in the deep things of God. Truth, it is said, lies at the bottom of a well, and as St. Basil justly remarks "Truth is hard to be taken by hunting, and must be found out by a narrow observing of her footsteps on every side."

It is with the hope of placing the doctrine of Predestination and Election in a simple light, and with the desire of making it helpful to many, that the Author has attempted the ensuing treatise.

Much confusion arises from the vague way of speaking of Election, as if there were but one object and one end of Election. God elects some to one thing and others to another. He has His election in the Church—He has His election in the Jew—and He has His election in the heathen. When therefore Election to eternal life is spoken of a degree of uncertainty and vagueness arises which is very embarrassing. This accounts to some extent for the endless amount of controversy which has arisen on the subject, some writers, really holding practically similar opinions, being apparently ranged in hostile ranks.

[1] Developments of Doctrine, cap. ii. § 1.

It must be clearly understood that in the first chapter—under the head "Predestination,"—the Author has referred to Predestination and Election in the abstract,—to Election to eternal life generally,—rather than to Election to any particular position of life and glory, to which it is the purpose of the Almighty to bring His Elect ones; and that he has examined the objections to Predestination generally, rather than entered into details. That chapter has been written mainly with the object of laying down in general terms those broad principles upon which the Scheme of Election subsequently propounded is based, and of leading up to it.

That so many of those taking part in the great controversy which has for generations disturbed the minds of men, have perverted and distorted the meaning of their opponents is remarkable. The fiery zeal and party asperity which have been displayed have caused Christianity to weep and infidelity to rejoice. And yet good Arminians and Calvinists approach much nearer to one another than they are able to see by reason of their attributing to each other doctrines which they respectively repudiate. For instance, Calvinists are apt to attribute to Arminians the denial of original sin, and of justification by faith, and to assert that they make holiness not only the qualification, but a part also of their claim to heaven. On the other hand, Arminians are apt to assign to their Calvinist brethren the holding of the doctrine of Election in such a way as to indulge in a secret persuasion that provided they have faith, it matters little whether it operates in good works, and that they not only exclude holiness as a meritorious condition, but deny its necessity

altogether, and thus practically echo the licentious maxim "let us sin that grace may abound."

Now it is quite clear that these attributed dogmas are not held by pious persons on either side—they find no place in their admitted creed. That there have been men of extreme views who have gone so far as to hold them and teach them cannot be denied, but the Calvinist or Arminian of the present day is in general, let us thank God, free from the extreme and highly offensive dogmas which have found favour on either side in past generations.

Much of the contention between the parties consists in the use of ill-defined terms and in mutual misapprehension. But it must be admitted that human language is almost inadequate as a vehicle for conveying what is often the intention of the writer, at least so as to be free from objection in the hands of an opponent, and the very best reasoners who have entered into the controversy have used terms which are ill-defined or vague, and which, to say the very least, have been open to objections when viewed from a different standpoint.

Let us then endeavour to be as little dogmatic as possible in our views, holding them in humility and sobriety, remembering the many eminent and pious divines who have thought differently from ourselves. Let us bear in mind that there may even be found excuses for the means which have been adopted in this polemic warfare. Divines on both sides have been actuated by a sincere desire to guard Christianity from what they have conceived to be errors of the highest importance. The means they have adopted may not have been wise, for they have usually departed from the broad outlines of Holy Writ to lay down propositions which they have conceived to be

less liable to abuse from the natural infirmity of human nature than the general terms employed by the inspired writers, but they have been prompted by pious motives. The effect of their departure from the written Word has invariably been, that while they have guarded one doctrine they have exposed another, and in attempting to escape from one error they have embraced another, and thus it may be said that Calvinism and Arminianism have reciprocally produced each other.

On so mysterious a subject we must be careful how we push to extremes the consequences of the views of those who hold opinions different to our own—how we impute as necessary, consequences which seem so to us from our point of view. Let us remember that advantages and blessings accrue from either view, when properly put forth by godly men.

The Author cannot lay claim to perfect impartiality. He has no doubt that, however desirous of being impartial, he has probably not given due effect to the position of those in opposition to his views—partly no doubt from the impracticability of entering thoroughly into their schemes and of giving sufficient weight to details to which they attribute importance. He however most sincerely trusts that he may have been kept by the power of God from the errors sadly too prevalent on both sides, and may have been guided to state in all humility what seemed to him to be the truth of Holy Scripture on the important subjects herein treated.

There is always a danger of outstepping the bounds of true Christian inquiry and attempting to search too minutely into the deep things of God—to peer into that which in our present condition is no doubt wisely hidden

from us; and he trusts that no words may appear in the ensuing treatise which do not, while being in accord with the Scripture of God and in harmony with His revealed purpose, tend towards the honour and glory of His Holy Name.

W. A. COPINGER.

THE PRIORY,
MANCHESTER,
9th September, 1889.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

HISTORICAL.

INTRODUCTION ... 1

DOCTRINAL.

CHAPTER I.

PREDESTINATION AND FOREKNOWLEDGE ... 115

CHAPTER II.

THE SUBJECTS OF ELECTION.

(a) Generally ... 179
(b) Testimony of the Old Testament ... 190
(c) Testimony of the New Testament ... 194
(d) Testimony of the Early Church ... 223

CHAPTER III.

THE OBJECT OF ELECTION.

(a) Generally ... 235
(b) Testimony of the Old Testament ... 240
(c) Testimony of the New Testament ... 242
(d) Testimony of the Early Church ... 246

CHAPTER IV.

THE CAUSE OF ELECTION.

(a) Generally ... 248
(b) Testimony of the Old Testament ... 254
(c) Testimony of the New Testament ... 257
(d) Testimony of the Early Church ... 264

CHAPTER V.

THE DOCTRINE OF FREE-WILL IN RELATION TO DIVINE GRACE.

(a) Generally ... 271
(b) Testimony of the Old Testament ... 310
(c) Testimony of the New Testament ... 314
(d) Testimony of the Early Church ... 320

Chapter VI.

Final Perseverance.

PAGE
(a) Generally 330
(b) Testimony of the Old Testament 349
(c) Testimony of the New Testament 351
(d) Testimony of the Early Church 365

Chapter VII.

Brief Notices of other Schemes of Election.

(a) Arminianism 371
(b) Calvinism, &c. 385

PRACTICAL.

Chapter VIII.

The Practical Effect on the Heart of the Doctrine of Election, and its Assistance in the Production of the Fruit of the Spirit 402

Chapter IX.

On Working out our Salvation with Fear and Trembling ... 423

Chapter X.

On Making our Calling and Election Sure 435

Chapter XI.

The Operations of the Holy Spirit Not Irresistible 446

Chapter XII.

The Assurance of the Elect... 455

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL.

Introductory Note.
Bibliography... ... ... i.
Index Nominum ... ... ccxvii.

Historical Introduction.

THE subject of Predestination has in past ages much exercised the minds of Christian men. Various schemes have from time to time been put forth, mostly said to be deducible from Holy Scripture. On careful examination the majority of these schemes will be found to have been based on isolated and detached portions of Scripture, and to be unsupported by the clearer parts of the Word of God.

Some writers have taken one set of texts, and deduced therefrom conclusions of their own, attempting to explain away the force of those texts which do not appear to harmonize with these conclusions; while others have taken another set of texts, and deduced conclusions from these diametrically opposed to the conclusions of the first, in like manner with their opponents attempting to explain away the force of all other texts which do not appear to be consistent with these conclusions.

Thus the systematic Calvinist will prove most logically that man is entirely passive in the work of salvation, that he is a mere machine in the hands of the Almighty, who imparts His grace, which is irresistible, only to those He has purposed to save; while the systematic Arminian will prove equally conclusively that man is a free agent, and able by his own strength to perform the commandments of God. Both these conclusions may be easily supported by insulated texts, and maintained with great show of reason. The former selects texts such as these: "No man can come to Me except the Father which hath sent Me draw him."[1] "You hath He quickened who were dead in trespasses and sins";[2] and the latter, "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling."[3] "Repent and turn yourselves from all your transgressions, so iniquity shall not be your ruin. Cast away from you all your transgressions, whereby ye have transgressed, and make you a new heart and a new spirit, for why will ye die, O house of Israel?"[4]

There is something true and something false in either system, and what is true and what false can only be ascertained by taking the Scriptures as a whole; for it is evident that no scheme can be admitted as setting forth the true doctrine of the Church which is at variance with the revelation which God has been pleased to make of Himself, nor which is inconsistent with any part of His Blessed Word.

[1] John vi. 44. [2] Eph. ii. 1. [3] Philip. ii. 12. [4] Ezek. xviii. 30.

The idea of absolute predestination was common to the ancient Philosophers. The Stoics put all things under a fate, even the gods themselves. And yet it is said that of all the sects of the ancient Philosophers, the Stoics came nearest to the Christian religion. Indeed, St. Jerome affirms that "in most things they agree with us. They assert the unity of the Divine Being, the creation of the world by the λόγος or Word, the doctrine of Providence, and the conflagration of the universe."[1] This agreement is not surprising when we consider that Zeno, the founder of the sect, was a Phœnician, as was also Antipater of Tarsus; others of them also were of Syrian extract, as Diogenes of Babylon and Posidonius, who doubtless conversed with and received much of their doctrine from their neighbours, the Jews. The Stoics affirmed that "fate is God Himself, to whom all things are subject and by whom all are determined, ordered, and directed as He pleases." And Seneca, who was one of their best writers, says, "If you call him (God) fate you will not be mistaken, since fate is nothing else but an implicated series of causes, and he is the first cause of all on which the rest depend,"[2] and in another part of his works he says, "if you call him nature, fate, fortune, they are all the names of the same God, using his power in a different way."[3]

The Stoic creed was essentially Pantheistic, and its God was diffused through all the stages of creation. The expressions employed in the writings of the Stoics do, indeed, at times agree marvellously with those found in the works of Christian writers, but the identity is only apparent—the meaning and spirit are far different. Whatever outward features of resemblance they may have, underneath there is an essential difference. In fact, the living principle of Stoicism was in deadly opposition to the Christian faith. The God of the Stoics was not a personal God; he had merely an eternal activity, not a will. He was the great first cause, the primeval fire, emanating from which is the soul of man in the form of a warm ether. It was not a person at all, but a principle, which acted; and the impersonal character of

[1] Hier. in *Esa*, c. 11. So Justin Martyr considered the Platonic philosophy not absolutely different (ἀλλοτρία) from Christianity. His idea was that before the coming of Christ there existed nothing in the world but the seeds (λόγος σπερματικὸς) of what was manifested afterwards in Christ as absolute truth.—Apol. ii., cap. 13. See Clem. Alex., *Strom.* i., cap. 20.

[2] *De Beneficiis*, lib. iv., c. 7.

[3] *Ib.* cap. 8. And in another place he says, Omnia certa et in æternum dicta lege decurrere. So Manilius, *Astron.*, lib. i.:—

"Nec quicquam in tanta magis est mirabile mole,
Quam ratio, et certis quod legibus omnia parent."

Where by *ratio* is evidently meant the decreeing mind of God, and by *leges* is meant fate, or that series of causes and effects which is the offspring of His decree.

Ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν καὶ ταῦτα καὶ τὰ πάντ' ἀεὶ
Φάσκοιμ' ἂν ἀνθρώποισι μηχανᾶν θεούς·
Οτῳ δὲ μὴ τάδ' ἐστὶν ἓν γνώμη φίλα,
Κεῖνός τ' ἐκεῖνα στεργέτω, κἀγὼ τάδε. SOPHOCLES, *Ajax*.

Stoic divinity had a tendency to close the heart against Christianity. The Stoic considered that he had the divine principle within; and he lost the idea of dependence on a superior being. Still there was the outward semblance which has deceived many. Thus we find in the writings of some of the Stoics that the Deity is spoken of in rapturous terms and in accents of the deepest piety, not only as an abstract Reason, but as a wise and beneficent Creator; but for all this, their creed was one of Pantheism undisguised. They thought that the existence of evil might be explained as an imperfection in detail, rendered necessary for the general perfection of the whole: thus they took the view which was adopted centuries after by Archbishop King, and looked upon evil as an inherent part of the creature—a flaw which even the providence of God could not have removed. Like Calvin, they were not perfectly consistent, and we do not see the result deduced from the theory which one would logically expect. They certainly deduced something higher and better than what might have been naturally anticipated from a fatalistic creed; for, not being content to rest in the contemplation of an infinite will and power working out its own plans in all the various forms of nature, they left the contemplative for the practical, and regarded their principles as imposing upon them the duty of constant warfare with evil, and as assisting in the active pursuits of a moral life.

The Epicureans regarded all things as at liberty, and either thought there was no God or at least that there was no Providence. The Jews had the same questions among themselves, for they could not believe their law without acknowledging a Providence; and yet the Sadducees among them denied the pre-determination of human actions and events, and asserted liberty in such a manner as to consider themselves free from all restraints. On the other hand, the Essenes ascribed all things to fate; while the Pharisees steered a middle course, holding the freedom of the will, with the view that all things were governed by a Providence. They ascribed some things to fate, but held that other things were left in a man's own power—whether he would do them or not was optional.

In the first ages of Christianity the Gnostics fancied that the souls of men were of different grades, being the creation of different principles or gods. Some souls were carnal, and devoted to perdition; others spiritual, and would inevitably attain salvation; while yet a third class were animal, or of a *middle* order, capable either of happiness or misery.

The origin of evil was always a difficulty with these heretics. Florinus, a presbyter of the Church of Rome in the second century, boldly taught that God was the author of evil.[1] The Marcionites thought that some souls were made by the bad god, and others by

[1] Eusebius H.E., v. 19, 20.

the good. Apelles, a follower of Marcion, owned but one principle, yet maintained that the oracles of the prophets were the production of an evil spirit. Some, as Potitus and Basilicus, admitted two original principles, while others acknowledged three. Tatian took from Valentine the fable of the Æons, and from Marcion the doctrine of two principles, and this system was enlarged by Severus later. He taught that the good God was in a heaven that had no name, that the world was made by the principalities and powers, and that the devil was the son of the great prince of the principalities. His followers added to this a little, and held that the superior part of man was the work of God, but that the inferior part and the woman were the work of the devil. Later, the Manicheans developed the dualistic doctrine of an evil principle in the form of a regular system, holding that as the world was filled with things contrary, good and evil, there must be two principles, the one good and the other evil. They considered both of these principles to be eternal, sovereign, immortal and independent one of another. They assigned to the good principle the name of God, and called the other Satan, the prince of the world, the wicked one. They further taught that good and evil having contended together, good was obliged to give up a part of itself to the bad, and that the existing system of the world was the product—a mixture partaking of the nature of both—a kind of compromise of good and evil principles.

Against the pagan and philosophical views contended for by most of the heretics above mentioned, Origen asserted that all souls were by nature equally capable of being either good or evil, and that the difference among men arose merely from the freedom of the will and the various uses of that freedom; that God left men to this freedom, rewarding and punishing them according to the use they made of it. At the same time he asserts most clearly that a Providence exists.

Origen thus followed with firmer and more deadly steps the path of error which Justin Martyr had trod before. There is a sad difference between the writings of the Apostles and of Apostolic men. Compare, for instance, the Epistle of Clement, however superior to the writings of those who followed him, with the writings of the Apostles Peter, Paul, or John. But the difference between the writers of the first century and those succeeding is almost equally marked. We can find little difficulty in agreeing with the writer who said "unus Augustinus præ mille Patribus; et unus Paulus præ mille Augustinis—(one page of Augustine is worth a thousand of other Fathers; but one page of Paul is worth a thousand of Augustine's.) Justin Martyr introduced a mode of thought and expression, the effect of his philosophic training, which was certainly foreign to the genius of the Gospel.

In his second apology he goes so far as to declare that the doctrines of Plato were not heterogeneous to those of Christ, but only *not altogether* similar, and he seems to consider that Plato and the Stoics saw something of truth from the portion of the seed of the Divine Word, which he makes to be the same as the Word, the only begotten Son of God. He confounded the light of natural conscience, which God has given to all men, with that light of Divine Grace which is peculiar to the children of God. Justin forgot the teaching of the Apostle, that "the world by wisdom knew not God,"[1] and commenced that mingling of the human with the divine, which has been the cause of so many of the heresies and divisions which have, from age to age, rent the Church of Christ. He was seduced unwarily by human philosophy to adulterate the Gospel, and though the adulteration was not to any very great extent, yet was it the spark from which Origen subsequently enkindled a flame. The language of the Church was gradually and silently changed from that of the first century. Purity and simplicity of expression gave place to mysticism and philosophic pedantry. The simple scriptural mode of expression was thought unsuited to the philosophic spirit which now raised its head as the Gospel found entrance into hearts shackled with the wisdom of this world.

Alexandria was in the beginning of the third century the most renowned seminary of learning. Philosophy here found itself in a position favourable for tapping the streams of two worlds, and Oriental imagination, combined with Greek philosophy, produced a remarkable system of pantheistic mysticism, which unhappily became blended with the pure doctrine of the Gospel. A class of philosophers appeared there calling themselves Eclectics, because, without tying themselves down to any one set of rules, they chose what they thought most agreeable to truth from all masters and from all sources. They took the mystical and theosophic elements contained in the doctrines of Pythagoras and Plato; in fact, they levied mail on the principles of all previous rival schools, the Academy, the Portico, and the Lyceum; and attempted to mould them into an harmonious mass. Ammonius Saccas, a famous teacher of Alexandria, first reduced the opinions of this sect to a system. He was professedly a Christian, but evidently thought that all religions, Pagan, Jewish, or Christian, were but parts of one religion. Taking Plato as his chief authority, and allegorising the various fables and systems of others, he undertook to produce a coalition of all sects and religions, and lost sight entirely of the divine character of revelation.

This was the natural effect of the Gospel finding some degree of honour in the world. Men began to perceive that their philosophy assumed an air of respectability where it found shelter under the

[1] I. Cor. i. 21.

mantle of Christianity. What a difference a few years had made! It has been justly observed that Seneca would have thought himself sufficiently liberal in not persecuting, but only despising the same religion which Ammonius a century afterwards deigned to incorporate in pretence at least with his philosophy.

In the beginning of the third century Clement, who was of the Eclectic sect, became a scholar of Pantænus, and succeeded him in a Christian catechetical school, said to have been open in Alexandria since the days of St. Mark. In this school and under Clement were bred the famous Origen, Alexander (Bishop of Jerusalem), and other eminent men. Origen subsequently took the charge of this school, and raised it by his genius and industry to great eminence. Heretics and philosophers attended his lectures, and the opinions of the different sects were confuted by opposition to one another. He no doubt mingled the doctrines of Christianity with pagan philosophy in such a way as to cause many of the heathen philosophers to embrace Christianity. But, however great the gain to the Gospel in the eyes of the world, the simplicity of the glad tidings was obscured. That Word which "is able to make a man wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished to every good work," lost its unique position in the hearts of many by the philosophical minglings of Origen.

He introduced a fanciful mode of allegorical interpretation of the Scriptures and a mode of exposition not properly controlled by Scriptural rules, and from this arose a vitiated method of commenting on the text which was succeeded by the opposite extreme —an entire contempt of types and figures.

Probably no man, not altogether unsound on the main principles of Christianity, ever did so much injury to the Church of Christ as Origen. He raised a thick mist, which for ages hung over the letter of Scripture and shut out from the eyes of men the true spirituality of the Divine Revelation.

Origen's works became very popular in the East, and Gregory Nazianzen and Basil drew a system of divinity out of them in which all that relates to the liberty of the will is very fully set forth. Chrysostom, Isidore of Damiata, and Theodoret, with their followers, taught it, and it became the received doctrine of the Eastern Church.

That man, as he is born into the world, is not in the original perfect state in which he left his Creator's hand in the Garden of Eden, had been the universally received doctrine of the Catholic Church. But from the earliest days various views were held as to the difference in his condition. We find the great minds of the West taking a broader and more extensive view of the consequences of the fall than those of the East. For instance, in the third and fourth centuries we have Tertullian and Cyprian, Hilary

of Poitiers, and Ambrose laying great stress on the corruption of human nature and the absolute necessity for an inward change of nature by Divine grace before man can live a life acceptable to God. On the other hand, in the East we have Clement, Chrysostom, and others laying great stress on the freedom of the human will and on its indispensable co-operation with Divine grace. In the fifth century divergence became apparent, and what was almost imperceptible at first had gradually developed into opposition, and a decisive controversy arose.

One of Origen's disciples was Pelagius, a British monk, held in great esteem in Rome both for learning and piety. He became much imbued with the spirit of the Greek theology, and carried the doctrine of his master to far greater lengths. In his peculiar system of doctrine he dealt with what is subjective in man, and reviewed the nature and character of his relation to God. He came to the conclusion, not as is usually stated, that man had suffered no injury by the fall of Adam (for he admitted that mankind were in a worse condition in consequence of the fall), but that the first sin was hurtful to the human race, not by propagation, but by example—non propagine sed exemplo—not because they who were propagated from him drew from him any vice or fault, but because all that have afterwards sinned have *imitated* him, the first sinner. He further held that there was no need of inward assistances in the then received Church view asserting an entire liberty in the Will. There was in his view "no original sin," and consequently no hereditary guilt. Adam, he thought, stood alone in his transgression and transmitted no evil taint to his posterity, or any tendency to evil. The evil example he admitted, but that was all.

Pelagius failed to realize the true character of the purpose of God in the creation of man. He regarded every human being as a moral agent complete in himself and separate from all others. Necessarily sin appeared to him as the free act of the individual, and in his opinion there could be no other connection between the sin of the one (Adam) and the sin of the many (his posterity) than that which exists between example on the one hand and voluntary imitation on the other.[1] He was not able to apprehend the purpose of the Almighty revealed in Holy Scripture in the creation of a race such as mankind. Reasoning of the same kind might have been applied to the Angels, created or called into being at one time, but not to a family developed out of one. Isolation has been truly said to be the principle of Pelagius and his school, while the principle of his great opponent, Augustine, is organisation—a principle founded on true philosophy, tested by the experience and observation of mankind. Pelagius admitted the influence of habit on the human will, but limited its effect,

[1] Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, Vol. I., 300.

looking on acts as separate entities and not as if they generated habits, and indirectly formed the whole moral character. He regarded the power of choice as a mere natural faculty, of physical not moral operation. He looked upon freedom as the highest good, and as essential to man's accountability to God. He taught that man is a self-determining moral agent, with the power of good and evil within himself.

Pelagius's first writings were an epistle to Paulinus of Nola, and some other little works, in which his erroneous views of grace were so cautiously and guardedly expressed, that only in the light of his subsequently more express enunciations of views did their heterodox character become apparent. His chief follower and companion was Cœlestius, probably an Irishman, a man much more open and daring in speech, and consequently more easily detected in heresy than Pelagius. He was summoned before a synod, held in Carthage in 412, by Aurelius, bishop of that city; and accused of holding and teaching the following opinions:—1. Adam was created mortal, and must have died, even if he had not sinned. 2. Adam's sin injured himself only, and not mankind. 3. Infants are born in the state of Adam before he fell. 4. Mankind neither died in Adam nor rose again in Christ. 5. The law, no less than the Gospel, brings men to the kingdom of heaven. 6. There were sinless men before the coming of Christ. On his refusal to retract he was excommunicated.

In 413, Pelagius, in a letter to a virgin named Demetrias, a member of one of the most illustrious families of Rome, more openly declared his views on the subject of grace.[1] He speaks, however, still ambiguously, as meaning by grace, either nature, or doctrine, or forgiveness of sins, or the example of Christ, but nowhere owns a positive influence of the Holy Spirit actually imparting the power of loving God. Augustine some years after wrote a refutation of this letter to Juliana, the mother of Demetrias.

About the year 415, two young men, Timasius and Jacobus, having been led by Augustine to renounce the errors concerning grace which they had imbibed from Pelagius, placed in Augustine's hands a book of their former master, in which he apparently denied the existence of all grace, and maintained that by that term were to be understood the natural endowments of the human mind, seasoned and directed by freewill, which endowment so seasoned and directed he acknowledged to be the free gift of God. This book Augustine replied to, sending such reply, together with Pelagius's book, to Innocent I. of Rome, and requesting him to mark the views of each, "and if he denies that there are his sentiments, I contend not, let him anathematize

[1] The Epistle will be found in Jerome's works, and was published, with a Tract by Dr. Whitby, in 1775, by Semler, *Halæ Magaeburgicæ*.

them, and in plain terms confess the doctrine of Christian grace." "I have," says he, "sufficient witnesses—men who have a great regard for him (Pelagius)—who will attest that I had the book from them, and that it has not been falsified by me." Innocent, in reply, condemned the book altogether as containing horrible sentiments.

In the latter part of 415, Pelagius was summoned before a synod of fourteen bishops of Palestine, at Lydda, then called Diospolis. His two accusers, Heros and Lazarus, Bishops of Gaul, were absent, one being sick at the time, and Pelagius so artfully explained his views as to obtain an honourable acquittal. In this synod he was defended by John, Bishop of Jerusalem, a an whom seemed to have only partially understood the point at issue. Augustine wrote to John on the subject a letter of expostulation, and endeavoured to undeceive him as to the real doctrine of Pelagius, and at a council held the next year at Carthage, 68 bishops wrote to Innocent of Rome their views on the controversy, urging that unless Pelagius expressly rejected the sentiments ascribed to him he should be excommunicated. The Epistle concisely sets forth the point at issue. In it the bishops say:—"They (the Pelagians) attempt by their praises of freewill, to leave no room for the grace of God, by which we are Christians, the Lord saying, "If the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." They assert that the grace of God consists in this—that He has so created the nature of man, that by his own will he can fulfil the law of God. The law itself, too, they reckon to belong to grace, because God has given it for a help to men. But the real grace of God, by which a man is caused to delight in the law after the inward man, they will not acknowledge, though they will not openly oppose. Yet what else do they in effect, while they teach that human nature is sufficient alone to enable men to obey the law, not attending to the scripture? 'It is not of him that willeth, or of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy; and we are not sufficient of ourselves to think anything as of ourselves.' We beseech you to observe the necessary consequence of such opinions, namely, that we have no need in their scheme to pray that we enter not into temptation; nor had our Lord occasion to say to Peter, 'I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not.' He might have contented Himself with exhorting or commanding him to keep his faith; and instead of saying to His disciples 'Watch and pray,' it would have sufficed to say 'Watch.' When St. Paul prays that the Ephesians might be strengthened with might in the inner man by His Spirit, they, in consistency with their plan, might have said they might be strengthened with might by the ability of nature received in our creation. It follows, too, that infants need not be baptised at all, as being perfectly innocent and needing no

redemption." The bishops declare that anathemas might be pronounced against anyone who dare teach and aver that the natural strength of man is sufficient to avoid sin and to accomplish God's commandments, and who dare affirm that children need not be delivered from perdition by baptism or that they can have eternal life without that Sacrament.

Another synod of 60 Numidian bishops, assembled at Milevum, wrote also to Rome to the same effect. Augustine likewise wrote, in the names of Alypius, Bishop of Tagasta, Aurelius of Carthage, Evodius, and Possidius, to Innocent showing how the Eastern council at Lydda had been most probably imposed on by Pelagius. "Without doubt," writes Augustine, "the grace by which we are saved is not that with which we are created; for if those bishops who acquitted him (Pelagius) had understood that he called that grace which we have in common with the wicked, and that he denied that which we have as Christians and sons of God, he would have appeared intolerable. I blame not then his judges, who understood the word grace in its common acceptation. Pelagius alone is not now our object, who, perhaps is corrected (I wish it may be the case), but many souls are in danger of being beguiled. Let him be sent for to Rome, and asked what he means precisely by the term grace; or, let him explain himself by letter, and if he be found to speak in the same manner as the Church of Christ let us rejoice in him; for whether he calls grace freewill, or remission of sins, or the precept of his law, he explains not that grace of the Holy Spirit which conquers lusts and temptations, and which He who has ascended into heaven has poured on us abundantly. He who prays 'lead us not into temptation' does not pray that he may be a man, that he may have freewill; nor for the remission of sins, the neglect of the former petition, nor that he may receive a command. Prayer itself, then, is a testimony of grace, and we shall rejoice that he is right or corrected; law and grace are to be distinguished—the law commands, grace bestows. If you will look into the book of Pelagius, given us by Timasius and Jacobus, and take the trouble to examine the places where we have marked it, you will find that to the objection made to him that he denied the grace of God, he says that *this grace was the nature in which God created us.* If he disown the book or those passages, we contend not; let him anathematize them and confess, in plain words, the grace which Christian doctrine teaches, which is not nature, but nature saved, not by external doctrine but by the supply of the spirit and secret mercy; for, though natural gifts may be called grace, yet that grace by which we are predestinated, called, justified, glorified is quite a different thing. It is of this the Apostle speaks when he says, if by grace then it is no more of works; and to him that worketh not, but believeth in Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for

righteousness; for if Christ had not died for our sins, Pelagius's possibility of nature, which he makes to be grace, would have been just the same."

Innocent though he did not entirely agree with Augustine would probably have condemned Pelagius had not death prevented him. Innocent's successor, Zosimus, whose doctrinal tendencies leant towards the Oriental Church, was at first friendly disposed to the Pelagian views, and in fact wrote two letters to the African bishops reproaching them for having too lightly considered the subject and given credit too readily to charges which could not be sustained. He testifies to the orthodoxy of Pelagius and his follower, Cœlestius. Zosimus seems to have failed to grasp the true doctrinal matter involved, and it was only after a strong protest from the African bishops, backed up by several edicts of the civil power obtained through the influence of the Bishop of Hippo, that he adopted the decisions of the Council of Carthage against the Pelagians, and issued a circular letter pronouncing sentence of condemnation on both Pelagius and Cœlestius.

In the year 418, the Emperor Honorius passed the sentence of banishment from Rome on all the followers of Pelagius.[1]

The works of Augustine against Pelagius are undoubtedly among the finest of his writings. Augustine had in early life been a Manichean, and though he renounced the errors of this sect its spirit seems occasionally to crop up in his contentions with the Pelagians.[2]

His system of grace was gradually developed, its great force and beauty coming forth as the arguments of the heretics came

[1] It is probable that Pelagius ultimately found his way to his native land. It is certain that his peculiar doctrine troubled this country for many years and called from Gaul Germanus, Bishop of Auxerre, and Lupus, Bishop of Troyes, who came over with the express object of rooting out Pelagianism, which had been accepted by many, and amongst others by Agricola, son of a Pelagian bishop called Severinus. In Italy Pelagianism seems to have had many defenders, and as many as 18 bishops in that country refused to subscribe to the condemnation of Pelagius, and in consequence were deprived of their sees and exiled to the East. As late as the 14th century Bradwardine complained that the whole world was gone after Pelagius, but it must be remembered that his view of Pelagianism was somewhat more extensive in its range than historical truth would probably warrant.

[2] We wish to be as impartial as possible, and to present both sides of the controversy as accurately as we are able, and it seems but right, therefore, to state that the idea given above was strongly attacked by the late Dr. Cunningham. He considered that the general experience of mankind shows that this theory of Augustine favouring a leaning towards Manichæism is most improbable; for it is much more likely that a man who had deliberately and from full conviction renounced a system of error, pervaded throughout by one uniform and peculiar character, should, in place of retaining and cherishing any of its distinctive principles, be rather apt to run into the opposite extreme. "Augustine," says he "assuredly did not run into the opposite extreme to Manichæism, else he would not have made such strenuous opposition to Pelagianism; but neither, in opposing Pelagianism, was he tempted to go to the opposite extreme to Manichæism, as he might probably—according to the tendencies which controversialists too often manifest—have been led to do, had he not previously sounded the depths and subtleties of Manichæism, and been led decidedly and deliberately to reject it." The statement as to the experience of mankind is undoubtedly true and the inference just; but we are dealing not with probability but with fact, and the reader must form his own judgment from the writings of the great father himself.

up against it. He regarded the human race as a concrete totality, setting forth with great eloquence the fearful and far-reaching effects of the fall. From the depths of his own consciousness he felt the dangers of the doctrine of Pelagius, but in his zeal for the truth he went so far as to assert that the whole of man's progress from salvation to glory is effected by the *irresistible* operation of the Holy Spirit, and that God from the foundation of the world decreed to save some men and to leave others to eternal punishment. So opposed were these views to those he had expressed before his contention with Pelagius that he deemed it necessary to issue his "Retractations," in which he acknowledged a change of opinions. "Propterea," says he, "nunc facio libros, in quibus opuscula mea retractanda suscepi, ut nec me ipsum in omnibus me secutum fuisse demonstrem."[1] His statement concerning God's foreknowledge as antecedent to His predestination he absolutely retracts.[2]

Augustine's mind was ever striving after consistency and unity. In his earlier works he gives far more weight to the freedom of the human will than the nature of his doctrine of predestination when fully developed could possibly allow. It is most interesting to trace the development of his doctrine in his successive works as they come forth from his maturing hand. In his latter writings he has to combat the views he had expressed in his earlier, coming finally to the conclusion that St. Paul teaches neither an election conditioned on the foreknowledge of faith nor an election conditioned on the foreknowledge of works growing out of faith. His original idea of freedom becomes gradually modified and is ultimately absorbed in so peculiarly limited an idea that it becomes in fact no proper freedom at all. On whomsoever God actually has mercy, whomsoever He actually chooses, him He calls in the way which is so befitting that the subject is *irresistibly* drawn by Him who calls, though he follows with freedom. The truth is, the great Bishop of Hippo confounds together two different ideas—ideas essentially distinct—the idea of freedom as experienced only in a certain stage of moral and spiritual development, and the idea of freedom as a certain faculty possessed in common by all rational minds. He took an accurate view of the former, but failed to appreciate and give effect to the latter. He denied freewill to man in his fallen condition without distinguishing between the two above distinct ideas, and thus, by denying to all men the latter, he shut out the possibility of some obtaining to the former.

[1] De Dono Perseverantiæ, cap. 21.

[2] Idem disputans quid elegerit Deus in nondum nato . . . . . ad hoc perduxi ratiocinationem, ut dicerem, *Non ergo elegit Deus opera cujusquam in præscientia quæ ipse daturus est; sed fidem elegit in præscientia, ut quem sibi crediturum esse præscivit, ipsum elegerit cui Spiritum Sanctum daret, ut bona operando etiam vitam æternam consequeretur;* nondum diligentius quæsiveram, nec adhuc inveneram qualis sit electio gratiæ.—*Retract*, lib. i., cap. xxiii.

He looked upon the ability to attain to the higher moral and spiritual freedom as a gift communicated, which is sound; but he ignored the fact of freewill itself being an inalienable possession of the rational spirit, which is unsound.

Augustine's doctrinal and polemical dissertations on the subject of grace and predestination not only caused disputes among the monks of Adrumetum, in North Africa, but among the Christians at Marseilles.

Prosper of Aquitaine, in an epistle to him in 429 on the subject, tells him that several Christians of Marseilles, having seen his works against the Pelagians, believed that what he taught concerning the calling of the elect was contrary to the Fathers, and that they were more averse to his views when they had read his book of Correction and Grace. Then he relates their opinion and says: (1) that they indeed acknowledge that all men have sinned in Adam, and that salvation is not the product of our works, but of grace that works the same by means of Regeneration; but they hold that the propitiation made by the blood of Jesus Christ is offered to all men without exception, so that as many as will embrace the faith and be baptised may obtain salvation; (2) that before the Creation, God by his foreknowledge knew those who would believe and who, with the succour of that grace enabling them to preserve that faith which they had once embraced, would maintain the same unto the end, and that He had predestinated them to His Eternal Kingdom, foreseeing that after He had freely called them they would make themselves worthy of His election and end their lives holily; (3) that God calls all men to the faith and to good works by His instructions, and that salvation is the reward of those who are willing to do good; (4) that whatsoever is said of the Decree of God's Will touching the call of men, whereby it is said that the Elect have been separated from the Reprobate is but calculated to inspire men with despondency, idleness, negligence, and lukewarmness, because it seems to no purpose to work if the Reprobate cannot be saved nor the Elect be damned; (5) that thereby all virtues are destroyed; (6) that this doctrine establishes under the name of Predestination a fatal and unavoidable necessity, or forces men to say that mankind were created of different natures; (7) that what is alleged out of the Epistle to the Romans to prove that grace goes before the merits of the Elect was never understood in this sense by any ecclesiastical writer; (8) that some reduce that grace which goes before our merits to the natural faculties of Freewill and of Reason by the good use whereof we arrive at that grace which makes us to be regenerated in Jesus Christ; (9) that God has indeed resolved to communicate His grace only to those who are regenerate, but that all are called to partake of that saving gift, whether it be by the natural law or by the preaching of the gospel; (10) that men are as much disposed

to good as to evil; that the Spirit and the Will may equally turn to evil, and that obedience or disobedience to God's command wholly depends upon our liberty; (11) that infants, dying before the use of reason, are either saved or damned, according to what God foresees that they would have been had they come to the age of acting and deserving; (12) that the same is to be said of the nations which God has not enlightened with the light that is necessary to salvation. Prosper asks Augustine to refute these opinions and to clear the difficulties proposed by them.

Hilary of Arles writes much in the same strain. He tells Augustine of the discussions which had arisen at Marseilles and other places on the doctrine of predestination, and that those who objected to the teaching of Augustine at the same time emphatically denied the doctrine that any strength remains in man by which in his fallen condition he may advance to soundness and health; and with the single exception of the doctrine in question they declared that they admire Augustine in all his words and actions. But this particular doctrine of predestination they strongly opposed, especially in its practical consequences. It is useless, they said, to preach to men and to exhort them if nothing remains in man capable of being aroused by admonition; if men are so predestinated as that no single individual can pass over from the one side to the other. What need, too, they strongly urged, was there to disturb the hearts of so many of the less intellectual believers by the uncertainty of such a discussion as had been started? For the Christian faith, they said, had been as successfully defended without this definition through a long series of years by many hands, in many previous writings, both by Augustine and others, and that against various opponents, and especially the Pelagians.

These epistles called forth from Augustine his two celebrated treatises entitled *De Prædestinatione Sanctorum* and *De Dono Perseverantiæ*. In these, however, Augustine could quote no earlier reliable authorities than Cyprian, Gregory Nazianzen, and Ambrose, whose words he assumed had the meaning he attributed to them. Of the three authorities quoted, Cyprian flourished in the middle of the third century and the other two lived during the latter part of the fourth, and their authority can only be deemed to support the view of Augustine under a forced and unreal interpretation of their words. Indeed it is but fair to Augustine to note that he does not contend that the passages he cites do more than support by inference the view that the Fathers were acquainted with the doctrine as he explains it. His words are—"These great teachers then assert that there is nothing which God has not given us or of which we can boast as our own; that our very hearts and thoughts are not in our own power; they give all to God, they confess that from Him we have received that we are perseveringly turned to God; that that which is good

should seem good to us, and that we should wish to honour God and receive Christ; that from undedicated we should be made dedicated and pious; that we should believe in the Trinity, and that also with one voice we should confess that which we believe. These things also they attribute to the grace of God; they acknowledge them to be the gifts of God; they bear witness that they are given to us by Him and not by ourselves. Will any one then say that they have so confessed this grace of God, as that they should dare to deny His foreknowledge, a thing which not the learned only but the unlearned confess? Assuredly, if they knew how to attribute these things to God so as not at the same time to be ignorant that He foreknew that He would give them, and that He could not be ignorant of those to whom He would give them; without doubt they knew predestination, which, preached by the Apostles, we are more laboriously and diligently defending against new heretics."

A laboured argument, proving absolutely nothing in favour of his own peculiar doctrine of predestination.

The discussion was carried on after Augustine's death, Prosper and Hilary doing battle on behalf of his views. Finding that these views were obstinately opposed in France, they went to Rome and endeavoured to influence Pope Cœlestine to take the matter in hand. The Pope willingly gave his aid, and in 431[1] wrote to the Gallic bishops admonishing them not to allow the spreading of doctrines not in accord with the true faith. He speaks in high terms of Augustine, but he expresses himself in such general terms concerning the agitation of curious questions that little advantage could be reaped by either party from his utterance. At the same time he caused to be drawn up a collection of principles approved by the authority of the Roman See on the disputed points. Whether Cœlestine himself drew up this collection has been much discussed, as it has been variously attributed to Prosper, St. Leo, and others, but probably without sufficient warrant. The articles are entitled "The Authorities or Sentences of the Ancient Bishops of the Holy Apostolic See concerning Grace and Freewill" The first of these articles declares that all men have lost, in the person of Adam, their innocency and their natural ability to do good, and that no man can be delivered out of this profound abyss of perdition by the strength of his freewill if he be not raised by the grace of the God of mercy. The second imports that no man is good of himself, if God, who is only good, does not communicate his goodness to him. The third is that no man can conquer the temptations of the devil and the motions of the flesh if he does not receive continual assistance from God, and if he have not the gift of Perseverance; which ought to be understood also of those

[1] This same year the 3rd General Council, held at Ephesus, which condemned Nestorius condemned also Pelagius, Cœlestius, and Julian.

who have been renewed by the grace of baptism. The fourth is that no man knows how to make use of his freewill but by the grace of Jesus Christ. The fifth is that all the good righteous men do ought to be referred to the glory of God, because no man can please Him but by the gifts of His grace. The sixth is that God acts after such a manner in the freewill of man that the holy thoughts, pious intentions, and all the good motions of the will proceed from Him. The seventh contains the decrees of the Council of Carthage, which had determined the absolute necessity of grace to do good. The eighth makes use of the prayers of the Church to show that all the good that we do from the first motion of conversion to our final perseverance is the effect of grace. The ninth shows that the exorcisms which the Church uses before baptism to drive away evil spirits are a clear proof of the necessity of grace to deliver us from the tyranny of the devil.

About this time John Cassian, the abbot of a famous monastery at Marseilles, took up a position equally removed from Augustine and Pelagius. He denied the two extreme views, seeing in both these opposite tendencies human presumption which would explore and define what is unsearchable to human reason. He controverts both those who wholly denied prevenient grace and made grace always dependent on man's desert, and those who denied to the human will any ability to create the germ of goodness by its own efforts and who supposed grace to be invariably prevenient. He affirms the insufficiency of freewill without grace for that which is good, and admits that without grace all human efforts avail nothing, although the operation of grace is, he asserts, ever conditioned on the free self-determination of the human will. He lays down the following propositions:—

That grace is the source not only of our good actions but also of our good thoughts. This grace is always present with us, and sometimes goes before our desires but also follows them.

That freewill is much impaired by the fall, but not utterly extinguished.

That there remains in man some knowledge of goodness and seeds of virtue.

That grace is given to perfect this knowledge and strengthen these beginnings; that although man can naturally choose good yet he has need of grace to accomplish it; and that this grace goes sometimes before the desires and first motions of the will, but mostly follows them.

That these two things being usually mixed together it is hard for us to know whether God shows us mercy because we have good inclinations in our hearts, or whether His mercy is precedent to those motions.

That it is safest to say that sometimes grace inclines the will to good, as it did in the conversion of St. Paul and St. Matthew,

but there are occasions when it follows, as in the conversion of Zacchæus and the good thief.

That man may of himself have a desire to be converted, and the beginning of repentance and faith; and that he may pray, seek a cure, send for the Physician, resist temptations, but he cannot be cured, he cannot be just, he cannot be perfect, and he cannot be a perfect conqueror without grace.

That this grace is a free gift, although God never denies it to those who are laborious on their part.

That we ought not to believe that no good proceeds from man.

That the good we do depends partly on grace and partly on freewill.[1]

To these views Prosper replied, maintaining Augustine's doctrine and asserting that the principles enunciated were the consequences of the errors of the Pelagians, and that it followed from them that grace is given according to every man's merits and that nature is not impaired by Adam's sin. It should be remarked that though Prosper maintains Augustine's doctrine, yet he qualifies it somewhat, certainly not to the extent argued by Du Pin,[2] who, speaking of Predestination and Reprobation, says he "supposes them to be built upon the foresight of man's good works." With considerable skill he avoids those portions of Augustine's scheme which seem most repulsive to the Christian feelings, but he does this rather by facility of expression than in actual reality. It was probably from the germs in Prosper's writings that the author of the book "De vocatione Gentium" laboured to produce some sort of reconciliation between the parties. This work has been variously attributed to Ambrose, Prosper, Leo the Great, and others, but there seems no preponderating authority for assigning it to any of the parties suggested. The author endeavours to show that an entire harmony subsists between the doctrines of grace and freewill, so that the one could not be maintained without the other. He argues that if freewill be taken away there is no organ left for the expression of virtue, and if on the other hand grace be taken away there can be no fountain from whence virtue can come forth. He urges that the whole good of man from the beginning of faith to the consummation of perseverance is a divine work and gift, yet he shows that man's departure from God is the consequence of his own will and not properly the result of a divine decree. He maintains three propositions:—

1st. That it is the property of the Divine goodness to desire that all may be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth.

2nd. That every one who is saved is directed by the grace of God and by the same grace kept unto the end, and

3rd. That the plan of the Divine will cannot be compre-

[1] Du Pin, *Ecclesiastical History*, vol. i., pp. 426, 7.
[2] *Ib.*, p. 489.

hended in its entirety and that much is above human understanding.

He distinguishes between two kinds of grace and three different bents of will and corresponding positions of men. The two kinds of grace are general (gratia generalis, generalia gratiæ auxilia) and special (gratia specialis, dona auxilia specialia). By the first the Almighty leads all men to the knowledge of Himself—it is seen in the revelation He has made of Himself to the natural spirit by the works of creation. But still the outward revelation it is admitted can only be truly received by virtue of the inner revelation in the heart through the consciousness of God in the mind itself. A universal inward general revelation to all is admitted, but none, it is asserted, can attain to salvation otherwise than by that special grace by which man's will becomes transformed through faith in Christ into a spiritual will. Why this special grace is imparted to some and not to all, and how it is reconciled with God's revealed will that all should be saved, the author does not attempt to explain. We are only told to stand by the faith that God invariably acts according to His own justice and wisdom. The three different bents of will are thus distinguished. First, the will directed to things of sense (the *voluntas sensualis*); second, the will which rises above the things of sense but is bent on its own ends (the *voluntas animalis*); and third, the will which the Spirit of God, with whom the man has come into communion, employs as His instrument (the *voluntas spiritualis*). This will is the germ of all virtue. It is by means of this that man refers himself entirely to God and performs His holy will.

The author denies that the nature of the will as such has been destroyed by the fall, but asserts that it requires the application of grace to it that it may operate according to the Almighty's will. He describes the effect of the fall as destructive of faith, hope, understanding, and will, for the purposes of holiness and salvation; and he affirms that no man has any resources for deliverance, because though by natural understanding he may endeavour to oppose his vices, and may in an outward way adorn this temporal life, yet he cannot proceed to true virtue and eternal happiness without divine grace.

Augustine's doctrine of predestination was certainly not received *in its entirety* by the Church at large, and in the year 441 was referred by Leo the Great to the Council of Orange, which seems purposely to have refrained from passing any censure on a man so highly and justly esteemed as Augustine. The Council distinctly approved of the doctrine of grace as stated by him against Pelagius, but in its concluding canon asserted that the doctrine of God's Predestination of some certain individuals to evil is not only to be disbelieved but also to be anathematized with all detestation.

The influence which Augustine exercised over the dogmatic

mode of thought of the age, specially in the West, was so great that, notwithstanding the declaration of the Council of Orange, his doctrine seems to have been pretty extensively received as orthodox on the points under consideration.

Little difference is discernible between the doctrine of election as held by Augustine and as held by those subsequently known as the Sublapsarians. In the main they agree with one notable exception, and that is the sacrament of baptism. Augustine held that with this sacrament there is joined an inward regeneration, and that this makes a difference between *the regenerate* and *the predestinate*. He, in opposition to the Sublapsarians, thought that persons thus regenerate might have all grace except that of *perseverance*; but he considered that they, not being predestinated, were certain to fall from their regenerate condition.

In fact it may be said that Augustine held two distinct predestinations, one to *regeneration* and the other to *perseverance* and final glory. Thus we find that he constantly refers to those who have been baptised and have thereby become regenerate as predestinate, and these he does not look upon as necessarily persevering to the end. They were, in his view, predestinated to regeneration and a state of grace, but for some cause in the just judgment of God not predestinated to final perseverance. In short he held that predestination to grace did not necessarily imply or lead to predestination to glory. He considered that there was a further decree concerning the regenerate, viz., that some of them should die before committing actual sin and be saved; but that of those who grew up to maturity some would be led on by the grace of God to final perseverance and glory, whereas others, not being gifted according to God's eternal purpose with the grace of final perseverance, would fall away. "Of two infants," says Augustine, "both born in sin, why one is taken and the other left, of two grown persons, why one is called so as to follow the caller, the other either not called or not called so as to follow the caller; these are inscrutable decrees of God. And of two godly men, why to one is given the grace of perseverance but to another it is not given, these are still more inscrutable decrees of God. Of this, however, all the faithful ought to be certain, that one was predestinated and the other was not."[1]

Towards the end of the 5th century we find a sect called "Predestinarians," (*Prædestinati* or *Prædestinatiani*) referred to by those who rejected Augustine's doctrine of predestination at least in its harsher aspects. In all probability there was no such sect

[1] Ex duobus atque parvulis originali peccato pariter obstrictis, cur iste assumatur ille relinquatur; et ex duobus ætate jam grandibus, impiis cur iste ita vocetur, ut vocantem sequatur; ille autem aut non vocetur, aut non ita vocetur; inscrutabilia sunt judicia Dei. Ex duobus autem piis, cur huic donetur perseverantia usque in finem, illi non donetur; inscrutabiliora sunt judicia Dei. Illud tamen fidelibus debet esse certissimum, hunc esse ex prædestinatis, illum non esse.—Aug., *De Dono Perseverantia*, § 21.

existing as a separate body, and it was but a mode of designating those who held Augustine's doctrine in the letter and pressed it to extreme. A tract, written by one of these predestinarians, asserting the doctrine of absolute predestination in the sternest asperity, cutting off all free self-determination from the creature and all contingency has been preserved. Among this so-called sect a Presbyter Lucidus is reckoned, and he certainly exhibited the doctrine in its most objectionable features. He taught that God's foreknowledge brought men into condemnation, and that those who perished were precluded from salvation by the decree of the Almighty irrespective of their actions. He was opposed by Faustus, Bishop of Rhegium, at a synod assembled at Arles, in 475, and being condemned retracted his errors.

Faustus did not follow the lines laid down by Augustine, but rather expressed in his writings the views of the Marseillian Christians who had been answered by the Bishop of Hippo. He was assailed by certain monks from the district bordering on the Black Sea (Scythian monks as they were called) who induced the African Bishop Possessor to bring the matter under the notice of Pope Hormisdas. The Pope, while admitting that Augustine's writings, especially his tracts addressed to Hilary and Prosper, were regarded as models of orthodoxy on the subject of grace and freewill, did not think fit to censure the work of Faustus. Faustus's work was subsequently sent to Fulgentius, Bishop of Ruspe, who wrote an able refutation of it and in defence of the system of Augustine. He denied a predestination to sin and spoke of a double predestination, the one to eternal happiness by the grace of Christ the other of those who were sinners by their own choice to deserved punishment.

At a synod held at Orange (Arausio), in the south of France, in 529, a scheme of doctrine drawn up by Cæsarius, Bishop of Arles, was approved, and in it the doctrine of prevenient grace as the cause of even the first motions of all goodness in the strict sense of Augustine was clearly asserted. The Council however declared against the predestinarian extravagances thus, "That God's power has predestinated certain individuals to sin we not only do not believe but if there are any who are inclined to believe a doctrine so monstrous we condemn them with the utmost abhorrence."

A subsequent council confirmed these decrees, and Boniface II. gave them his approbation.

Gregory the Great, Bishop of Rome, in 589, followed closely on Augustine's doctrine, but directed its influence rather to practical christianity than to speculative theories. He adopted it so far as it tended to produce humility and self-abasement, but declined to follow into the examination of theories which apparently could yield but little practical fruit. He discouraged any attempt to search

into the hidden and incomprehensible. He looked upon knowledge in God as causative, creative, and eternal, a view which necessarily excluded the idea of predestination being conditioned on a foreknowledge of given events, yet he would not extend God's knowledge in such a way as to make it the cause of evil, to which the idea that His knowledge is causative obviously led. The passage in Isaiah xlv., 7, where it is said God creates good and evil, he understood to mean as to evil only such as God ordains for good. He regarded evil as being in itself a negative thing and as not therefore referable to the creative agency of the Almighty. Touching the relation of freewill to grace, he thought that every motion to good must proceed from divine grace, but that freewill might co-operate while grace worked within it in a manner conformable to its nature; following the call of grace with free self-determination. "O, what a consummate artist is that spirit," he bursts forth. "Without the tardy process of learning, the man is impelled onward to all that His Spirit wills. No sooner does He touch the soul than He teaches, and His touch is itself a teaching; for at one and the same time He enlightens and converts the human heart; it suddenly turns stranger to what it was and becomes what it was not."[1]

About the middle of the 9th century, Gottschalk, a Benedictine monk of Orbais, in the diocese of Soissons, brought the views of Augustine again into public notice and supported them with great vehemence. He taught distinctly that there was a double predestination (*prædestinatio duplex*) of the elect to glory and of the reprobate to death; that God had of His free grace predestinated the elect to life eternal, and the reprobate, who will be condemned by reason of their own wickedness, He has equally predestinated to eternal death. He looked on God's knowledge and His will as one, and this knowledge and will as causative and creative, both in this and his double predestination following Fulgentius, a name very often attributed to him, no doubt on account of the similarity of their scheme. He accordingly identified divine foreknowledge with predestination, holding that the wicked were as much destined to be lost as the righteous to be saved; that each were so destined by an arbitrary decree of the Almighty, and that those doomed to be eternally lost could never be more than nominal subjects of grace, or more than apparent partakers of the sacraments. He did what the great Bishop of Hippo had not dared to do. Augustine had looked simply on the side of redemption and grace, Gottschalk pushed the inquiry on the other side and boldly proclaimed the doctrine of reprobation.

[1] O qualis est artifex iste Spiritus! Nulla ad discendum mora agitur in omne quod voluerit. Mox ut tetigerit mentem docet solumque tetigisse docuisse est, nam humanum animum subito ut illustrat immutat, abnegat hoc repente quod erat, exhibet repente quod non erat.—Gregor., lib ii. Hom. in Evang. xxx., § 8.

It had been customary with those holding Augustine's doctrine to distinguish the reprobate by the name præsciti, from the prædestinati chosen to salvation, no doubt having in view the exclusion of the idea of attributing injustice to God or making Him in any sense the author of sin. It is true that while Augustine does not invariably maintain the distinction, still he always keeps in view the fact that the first sin was the free act of a free creature, and the Catholic truth, which he held in absolute terms, that all had sinned in Adam and were liable to the just punishment of God, His whole scheme of predestination being based on the fall.

Gottschalk, in his desire to hold the doctrine of absolute predestination, went one step further back than Augustine, and represented the state of our first parents also as not conditioned by their own free self-determination but as the necessary fulfilment of an unconditional divine decree. This became necessary in order for Gottschalk to support his scheme consistently, he having identified foreknowledge with predestination and made no distinction between an act of will, an act of creation, and an act of permission on the part of God. It is most difficult to say that he departed in any particular from Augustine, for even the scheme as he laid it bare was fairly deducible from Augustine's works, yet at the same time it was not the doctrine as finally matured by him. As we propose presently to show, Augustine held the view subsequently known as the Sublapsarian, while Gottschalk held the view subsequently known as the Supralapsarian. Gottschalk further taught that Christ died not for those whom He had predestinated to damnation but for those only whom He had predestinated to life.

In 847, Gottschalk, while visiting at the house of a Count Everard, in Piedmont, met Notingus, Bishop of Vienne, and in a conversation with him on divine predestination contended that according to the doctrine of Augustine there was a twofold predestination—a predestination to life and a predestination to death. Notingus brought the matter before Rabanus Maurus, Archbishop of Mayence, who immediately wrote a treatise against the views which Gottschalk had expressed. In this treatise he distinguishes between divine foreknowledge and predestination, between the præsciti and the prædestinati, and accuses his opponent of teaching that predestination is so made that every man predestinated to life cannot be damned, and every man predestinated to damnation cannot be saved. He chiefly opposed the latter idea, asserting such a predestination to be inconsistent with the goodness and justice of God. He contended that the predestination alone asserted in Holy Scripture has reference to the elect, that all men having fallen in the first man none can be delivered but by the grace of Jesus Christ. That those who are freed from the state of damnation (into which all have come by reason of Adam's sin) by

holy baptism are afterwards condemned only for the sins which they commit wilfully and freely, and that it is by the foresight of their evil will that their punishment is predestined. He would assert that God predestinates those whom he foreknew as the wicked to everlasting punishment, but he would not say that God predestinated them to everlasting punishment apart from this foreknowledge. In his view God predestinates things only because He foresees the manner in which they will happen, with this distinction, that as to good He both foresees and predestinates, while as to evil He foresees only. That out of the whole mass of mankind God, by free grace, accepts those whom He pleases, and leaves others, ordaining them to damnation by reason of the sins He foresees they will commit freely. In answering the question how the different conduct of God towards those whom He leaves to their deserved fate, and towards those whom He saves from it, could be reconciled with faith in the holiness and justice of God, he refers to a secret divine counsel and to the incomprehensibleness of the divine dealings. Rabanus's difference with Gottschalk was not so much a dispute of doctrine as of the harsher or milder forms of expression of it.

To this treatise Gottschalk wrote a reply, maintaining that reprobates are predestinated by an actual decree of God to damnation. He was so convinced of the truth of his opinions and confident in his assertions that in accordance with the spirit of the age he desired that he himself and his cause might be put upon their trial. He would undertake to pass through four cauldrons full of scalding water, oil, and pitch with safety, assured that God would deliver him and approve his cause by miracle. Wise men were however not willing to take the unfortunate man at his word.

Gottschalk's doctrine embraced the five following points, which are clearly Augustinian *with a logical deduction*:—

1. Ante omnia secula, et antequam quicquam faceret a principio Deus quos voluit prædestinavit ad regnum, et quos voluit prædestinavit ad interitum.

2. Qui prædestinati sunt ad interitum salvari non possunt, et qui prædestinati sunt ad regnum perire non possunt.

3. Deus non vult omnes homines salvos fieri, sed eos tantum qui salvantur; et quod dicit Apostolus 'Qui vult omnes homines salvos fieri,' illos dicit omnes qui tantummodo salvantur.

4. Christus non venit ut omnes salvaret; nec passus est pro omnibus, nisi solummodo pro his qui passionis ejus salvantur mysterio.

5. Postquam primus homo libero arbitrio cecidit, nemo nostrum ad bene agendum, sed tantummodo ad male agendum, libero potest uti arbitrio.

In 848 a Council was held at Mayence, under the Archbishop,

when Gottschalk was accused by Rabanus. They both agreed that predestination to life is free and that God chooses whom He pleases out of the corrupt mass of mankind to salvation, bestowing upon them all necessary grace as means for that end; and further that God deals in a similar manner with the reprobate whom He condemns to eternal death for their sins, of which He is in no wise the cause. But they differed in that while Rabanus denied that there was any decree respecting the reprobate, Gottschalk stoutly maintained that there was. In short, Gottschalk was accused of the very same views which are invariably attributed to Calvinists by those who differ from them, namely, that God has predestinated men to damnation without any prevision of their wickedness, but they equally with Gottschalk deny that any man is predestinated to damnation except for his crimes.

Gottschalk having been ordained in the diocese of Soissons was sent by the Council to Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, who shortly after brought him before the Council of Quiercy. Here Gottschalk maintained the same opinions he had expressed at Mayence, and was in consequence condemned, according to the Canons of the Council of Agatha and the order to which he belonged, to be beaten with rods and imprisoned. The sentence was carried out with the utmost severity, for he was whipped in the presence of the Emperor Charles and the bishops till he cast out of his own hand into the fire a book wherein he had made a collection of such texts of scripture and testimonies of the fathers as were in favour of his views. After this he was committed to the monastery of Hautvilliers, in the diocese of Rheims, where he was kept a close prisoner.

Gottschalk still continued of the same mind, and from his confinement sent forth two confessions of faith in which he acknowledged that God had not predestinated any man to sin or evil, but that the predestination of men to damnation was on account of their sins which God foresees they will commit. He supported his views by citations from Holy Scriptures and the writings of the Fathers, mainly relying on St. Augustine, Gregory, Fulgentius, and Isidore. His doctrine seemed to him so closely connected with the essence of the Christian faith that he was of opinion that whoever denied the predestination of the wicked by God to everlasting punishment made God a mutable being not to be placed on a level even with a man acting after wise and mature consideration.[1]

The unfortunate Gottschalk continued firm in his opinions until

[1] In his larger confession of faith his words are: "Videant quale sit et quantum malum, quod cum omnes electi tui, omnia bona semper fecerint faciant, et facturi sint, cum consilio (prout videlicet adjuvantur à te gratuito tuæ benignitatis auxilio) præsumant non solum mentiendo, sed etiam peierando palam omnibus affirmare, quod tu qui totius es auctor, fonsque sapientiæ, immo trina, et una sempiternaque sapientia, volueris, vel valueris, vel etiam debueris quicquam (quod absit) absque consilio patrare."

his death, in 868, Hincmar refusing him the Holy Communion in his last sickness except on condition of a full and explicit recantation which he refused to give.

Hincmar, Ratramnus or Bertram, a monk of Corby, Prudentius, Bishop of Troyes, and others continued the controversy, and Lupus Servatus wrote a treatise with the intention of reconciling the views held on either side. In his work (De tribus quæstionibus)[1] he lays down that God, who only is immutable, has made spiritual creatures subject to change who may do either good or evil; that man, who is a compound being of body and soul, was created in a state of happiness and perfectly free and exempt from death; that he could do good by using the assistance of God's grace and evil by failing to make use of it, but having sinned freely he is under an unavoidable necessity of dying and is subject to the irregular motions of concupiscence; that since the fall he has a certain kind of freedom, but cannot choose that which is good except by the assistance of divine grace; that his liberty inclines him only to evil, and so he may ruin himself, but he cannot save himself or free himself from the power of sin but by the aid of grace; that those that are reprobated are so by God's justice, while those that are saved are so by His gracious mercy, for all deserve damnation by reason of the sin of Adam, and no man could escape it were God not to deliver him in mercy; that we must not enquire why God shows mercy to some and not to others, but that He could save all were it His pleasure is asserted; that the predestination of the elect is not conditioned on His knowledge of their conduct but is gratuitous and not dependent on human merit; that it is in pursuance of this election that God gives His grace to some, by which they are able to do good, and leaves others to their corrupt wills by not assisting them; that He is not the author of the evil men do, which must be imputed to the devil, who leads them into it; that God foresees both good and evil, but he predestinates nothing but the good, while He permits or suffers the evil and punishes it; that what God has predestinated must infallibly happen, but at the same time His predestination imposes no necessity. Servatus passes lightly over the question about predestination to damnation, which was the main point at issue, confessing that he does not find the word used in that sense in Holy Scripture, and that the Church has always abhorred the expression for fear men should think that God has made his creatures to punish them, and that He unjustly condemns persons who have no power to avoid sin or damnation. That nevertheless it is true that as the Almighty ordained the punishment which was consequent upon the sin of the first man, so He has ordained the punishment of sinners, but so that they are themselves the authors

[1] Mauguin's Veterum Auctorum qui IX sæculo de Prædestinatione et gratia scripserunt, vol. II., p. 9.

of their own damnation. That since men agree in the matter they should not quarrel respecting the words in which it is expressed.

Bertram's treatise is divided into two parts. In it he does not refer to Gottschalk, though he adopted the doctrine of a twofold predestination. The first part of his work contains a collection of passages out of the Fathers acknowledging the general providence of God. He asserts that although God is not the cause of the crimes of the wicked, yet, as being subject to the order of Providence, they serve for the execution of His will; that God has foreseen from all eternity what shall befall the good and evil, the elect and reprobate; that the Predestination of the Saints is the effect of His mercy; that all the holy thoughts and good actions of the saints are the effect of the mere grace of God; that our freewill is too weak to do of itself any good, and needs, in order that it may adopt what is good, the grace of God; that this grace operates in us to will and to do, and that it is necessary for the beginning as well as the continuance of faith. In his second book Bertram treats of the Predestination of the Elect. He shows by the testimonies of the Fathers that God has not predestinated sinners to sin but to the punishment of their sins. He supposes predestination in respect of the reprobate to be grounded on foreknowledge, rejecting the distinction of those who say that eternal punishment was ordained and appointed for sinners, but they were not predestinated to it. He denies that this predestination imposes a necessity of sinning upon any man, but admits that those whom God leaves in the mass of perdition shall be infallibly damned for the sins which they have voluntarily committed.

The works of Servatus and Bertram were replied to by John Scotus Erigena, on the invitation of Charles the Bold, in 851, who maintained that predestination does not impose any necessity, and that man is absolutely free, notwithstanding the fall, and though he cannot do good without the grace of God yet he does it without being constrained or forced by the will of God. Though he admits it is only by grace that the corrupt will of the elect can be awakened to goodness, yet he assumes man to be free within his own individuality. He does not give that effect to the fall which was the generally received idea of the Catholic Church at the time he wrote, for he ascribes to fallen men the ability for good, though admitting that this ability could only come into actual exercise through the influence of the grace of God. He considered that there even remained in man, notwithstanding his fall, a certain natural freedom which manifested itself in his innate longing after blessedness.[1] He objected, mainly on metaphysical grounds, to the idea of God's predestinating and foreknowing the future, because to Him all things are present. In relation to the Almighty

[1] Manente tamen adhuc naturali libertate, quæ intelligitur beatitudinis appetitu, qui ei naturaliter insitus est.

we cannot speak of a before or an after. Hence it is only in an anthropopathic way, not in a strictly accurate sense, that a foreknowledge or a foreordination can be predicated of God. But assuming such expressions to be permissible, then he admits divine predestination to be eternal. He disagrees with Gottschalk, attributing his narrow views to ignorance of Greek learning, and contends that predestination relates to what is good only and not to what is evil. He insists that sin and its consequence, the punishments with which it is attended being mere privations, are neither foreseen nor predestinated, for being mere negations—nonentities in fact—they have no proper being and therefore could not preexist in the mind of God. Consequently he denied the doctrine of reprobation. Predestination, according to his views, exists only in relation to those things which the Almighty preordains in order to eternal happiness, and this predestination he alleges arises from a foresight of the good use of freewill. With a certain amount of truth Erigena unfortunately mixed most extravagant notions. He proceeded on philosophical grounds, and his work is full of scholastic subtleties and distinctions.[1] Archbishop Wenil., of Sens, published 19 propositions from Scotus's book, which he declared were heretical, and the book itself was answered by Prudentius and Florus, a deacon at Lyons, the former holding that while prescience extends to sin, predestination does not; but adopting the idea of predestination as twofold, he taught that by one God freely predestinates the elect to grace and glory, and by the other He destines the wicked, whose sins he foresees, to eternal damnation. He denies that man, since the fall, has full liberty and power to do good, or that any man affirms either that grace wholly destroys freewill or that predestination imposes any necessity upon men, asserting freewill to be nothing but a voluntary choice and unconstrained acting of the mind. The treatise of Florus was intended as a complete refutation of the work of Scotus. The idea that evil and sin were nonentities and therefore not the objects of divine knowledge he attacks as blasphemous, and agrees with Augustine in thinking that man, even in his original state of innocence, required divine grace in order to persevere in holiness.

In 853, Hincmar obtained the sanction of several bishops to what he termed four heads of divinity, and these were published by the authority of the Emperor and are known as the Articles of Quiercy. In these the doctrine of predestination was placed upon foreknowledge. "*Secundum præscientiam suam* quos per gratiam prædestinavit ad vitam elegit ex massa perditionis. Cæteros autem quos justitiæ judicio in massa perditionis reliquit, perituros præscivit, sed non ut perirent prædestinavit."

[1] Two Councils condemned the work of Scotus. Scotus may be termed the author of Rationalism.

There is not much here that Predestinarians even of an extreme school would object to, yet on their being sent to the Church of Lyons, Remigius, who was then Archbishop there, interpreted the *præscientia* as the foreknowledge of the individual's good life, and as implying this to be the foundation of the decree of predestination. He perceived, too, that the Articles practically rejected the doctrine of the prædestinatio duplex, for they asserted but one predestination of God referring either to the gift of grace or to the retribution of justice. He accordingly wrote a work in opposition to the Articles, which he termed "A Censure of the Articles of Quiercy." In his Censure he replies to the Articles seriatim. He objects that they speak of the predestination of the elect as if it were made upon account of their foreseen good works, and denies that God has predestinated the wicked to damnation. He acknowledged a twofold prescience and predestination centring on two classes of persons, the elect and the reprobate, asserting that the election of the former is absolute, gratuitous, and unmerited, and the punishment (not the reprobation itself, he does not go so far as this,) of the latter is owing to their foreseen ungodliness, which foreseen ungodliness results not from any compulsive force offered to them or put upon them by God but from that stubborn and persevering wickedness which God is indeed able to remove, but under the power and guilt of which it is His inscrutable will to leave them. Remigius complains also of the way in which the Articles had spoken of freewill. It was asserted by the 2nd Article that the freewill which we have lost by the sin of the first man is restored by Jesus Christ, and we have a full power to do good by the assistance of His grace and to do evil being forsaken by it. He conceived this statement open to objection, and denied that we had utterly lost our freewill by the sin of the first man, asserting that it still subsists but cannot be used without the assistance of grace. He considered that all men have naturally judgment, reason, and understanding by which they are able to distinguish that which is good from that which is evil, and that they have also a liberty of choosing good in some sort, but they are biased by their inclinations. He freely admitted, however, that we can do nothing towards our eternal happiness but by the inspiration and motions of grace.

The doctrine as stated by Remigius was affirmed in a Council held at Valence, in 855, in which were present 14 Bishops of the Provinces of Lyons, Arles, and Vienna, 3 Archbishops, and Ebbo, Bishop of Grenoble. They made 6 Canons concerning grace, freewill, and predestination. In the 2nd they declared that God had foreseen from all eternity all the good which righteous men will do by His grace, and all the evil that sinners will do by their own malice. That the righteous shall receive eternal life as a reward of their good actions, and the wicked be condemned justly for their

crimes to eternal punishment. That this prescience lays no necessity upon any man, none being condemned but for their original or actual sins. In the 3rd the predestination of good men to eternal life and of wicked men to eternal death is strongly asserted. Nevertheless in this way, that in the choice of those who shall be saved the mercy of God goes before their good works, while in the damnation of those who perish their crimes go before the just judgment of God (*in electione tamen salvandorum misericordiam Dei præcedere meritum bonum, in damnatione autem perituro-rum meritum malum præcedere justum Dei judicium*). That God has predestinated no man to sin by His own power, so that no man is under the necessity of being damned. In the 4th Canon the Council reject the four Canons of Quiercy as idle, vain, and false, and condemn Scotus's treatise as ineptæ quæstiunculæ et aniles pœne fabulæ. In the 6th they declare that as concerning the grace of Christ, by which men are saved, and the freewill of man weakened by the sin of Adam but restored by the grace of Jesus Christ, they hold as the Fathers have taught, what the Councils of Africa and Orange have decided, and what is held and maintained by the Bishops of the Apostolic See.

These Canons were opposed by Hincmar, who wrote two elaborate treatises against them and in favour of his four heads of divinity. The main point of dispute between the parties seems to have been that whereas Hincmar considered that though God has prepared and predestinated eternal punishment for the crimes of the reprobate he would not admit that the Almighty had predestinated them to be damned. He admitted a predestination to life eternal but refused to acknowledge a predestination to damnation, insisting on the distinction between leaving men in their sinful state and ordaining men to punishment. "Quosdam autem, sicut præscivit, non ad mortem neque ad ignem prædestinavit, *sed in massa peccati et perditionis juste deseruit*, a qua eos prædestinatione sua (*i.e.* gratiæ præparatione) occulto sed non injusto judicio nequaquam eripuit." On the other hand his opponents affirmed distinctly that God, foreseeing the sins which the wicked would voluntarily commit, had predestinated and condemned them on this account to damnation.

The whole difference was rather verbal than real, for there can be but little difference between leaving men in a certain state, of which punishment will be the consequence, and ordaining them to that punishment; and Remigius exposes the irrelevancy of the distinction attempted to be drawn by Hincmar. "Mirum valde est quomodo negare contendunt eum æternam ipsorum damnationem prædestinasse, quos jam ab ipso mundi exordio, cum primus homo peccavit, et omne humanum genus ex se propagandum unam massam damnationis et perditionis fecit, manifeste dicant in eadem damnationis et perditionis massa justo Dei judicio depu-

tatos et derelictos. Quid est enim massa damnationis et perditionis ab initio mundi divino judicio effecta, nisi eodem divino judicio æternæ damnationi et perditioni distinata et tradita?"[1]

Later, the Schoolmen brought the subject of predestination into notice, and though the earlier writers among them seem to have followed Augustine pretty closely, the later adopted his views only with considerable modification. One cannot fail to observe how desperately the ethical principle, which they adopted from Aristotle, strove to discover some outlet for giving effect to the freedom of the will while yet holding to the rigid consistency of the Augustinian doctrine. It accounts in great measure for the many contradictions and inconsistencies we meet with in their writings. In the province of the natural reasoning they were under the dominion of Aristotle, while in the spiritual province they felt themselves bound by Augustine.

The experience of Christianity in its relationship to the two great schools of philosophy has been remarkable. She became, as we have seen, early entangled with the theories of the Platonizing Christians, and not without difficulty freed herself from the snare of the Alexandrian School. On its surface there can be no doubt that Plato's philosophy was nearer akin to the doctrines of Christianity than Aristotle's. There was about it a vagueness, an elevation of sentiment, a subdued pious influence which seemed to harmonize better with the Spirit of Christianity than the formality of thought and feeling pervading the Aristotelian philosophy. There was more to stir the feelings and inspire enthusiasm; it was more readily adaptable to and more easily reconcileable with the doctrines of the Church. The philosophy of Aristotle crept into the Church at a later period and more with the gliding of the serpent. At first the Peripatetic School was looked upon with aversion, its tendency being regarded as fraught with danger, as calling forth in a one-sided direction the understanding which stood chiefly in a negative relation to the dogmas of the Church. Besides which, in the early days of Christianity, it had been the storehouse from which the heretics had derived their weapons and the source whence they had learned to use them to the greatest advantage. There is little doubt that the success scored by those in opposition brought the Church to seek to meet her opponents with their own weapons. Little by little the Aristotelian philosophy gained ground until it permeated every department of theology and was applied to the systematic development of every sacred truth. And it is most remarkable to find the church of the middle ages building on that very Aristotelism

[1] *De tribus Epistolis liber*, cap. xxviii. Mauguin has defended most learnedly the cause of Gottschalk, and has collected all the treatises written on both sides of the controversy. The work was published in Paris, in 1650, in 2 vols., under the title "Veterum auctorum qui Nono sæculo de Prædestinatione et Gratia scripserunt opera et fragmenta." And Usher has also written the history of Gottschalk.

which the early Church denounced as the source and ground of all unbelief and heresy.

The great minds of the middle ages probably perceived (and there were "giants" intellectually in those days) that the Aristotelian philosophy might be made most powerful in their hands, if wisely used, for meeting the growing positive element of the times. The peculiar combination in Aristotle of dialectical acuteness with sound experimental observation, the marvellous range of his inquiries and skill in the application of universal laws to particulars, possessed a charm which by their force and beauty as much held the Schoolmen in bondage in the province of natural reason as Augustine swayed their mind in the spiritual province. They found by distinguishing between the different positions of nature and grace, between the natural and supernatural, that they might without difficulty bring the doctrines of Aristotle into harmony with those of revelation.

The main notion of the Schoolmen concerning the Supreme Being was as the Principle of Causation or Efficiency, and this was drawn from analogies in the human mind as the means of tracing up the facts of the visible world to their fixed principles in God.[1]

The idea of God as an energy, as a moving power, runs through all their writings; this was the Aristotelian notion revived. And with this idea they incorporated the Platonic notion of a real participation of Deity in the soul of man. Dr. Hampden[2] has ably pointed out how they found the Platonic view of *assimilation* or association with the divinity to harmonize better with the expressions of Scripture, which speak of man as created in the *image* of God, of our future state as *like* that of the angels of God, and which holds out to us an example of divine holiness for our *imitation*, than with the Aristotelian idea, which was rather that of a mechanical or material *approach* to the divine principle—an *attainment* of the Deity as an end of our being. In support of their combination of the two notions they found many expressions in Holy Scripture. They therefore ingrafted the Aristotelian idea of motion and gradual growth unto perfection upon the Platonic idea of association, claiming in support all those passages of Holy Scripture which refer to growth in grace, to going on unto perfection and so forth.

The realism of the Schoolmen is precisely the same as the modern idea of *necessity*. Much as our modern philosophers would scorn to derive their discoveries from such a source, this is distinctly traceable. Rational and material agents were confounded, and the laws applicable to the latter were indiscriminately applied to the former. Actions were analysed mentally into motives and

[1] Hampden's *Bampton Lectures*, Lect. IV.
[2] *Bampton Lectures*.

ends, and this mental distinction was converted into forces and effects. The peculiar character of rational agents, as endowed with a principal of motion intrinsically in their own nature and therefore spontaneous and variable in their course of action, was entirely lost sight of.[1] The Schoolmen looked upon grace as operative to suspend or exclude human freedom and conceived that freedom if and so far as it could work merit, whether of congruity (*ex congruo*) or even of worthiness (*ex condigno*), takes the place of grace. But the objection to these ideas is, first, that grace, as thus conceived, so far as it excludes freedom instead of employing it for the communication of itself, is magical; and secondly, that freedom, as thus conceived, so far as it puts aside grace or stands in its own strength, is tainted with Pelagianism. They are so conceived as that they cannot be represented as working simultaneously: and the co-operation of grace and freedom as thus conceived served to form the basis of a false independence of his Creator on the part of man, which is the fundamental error of Pelagianism. It is true the scholastic system of Aquinas laid more emphasis on grace, and Scotus more on freewill, but both schemes were alike open to objection on the same grounds in different aspects.

Anselm, who may be regarded as the founder of Scholasticism proper, looked upon prescience and predestination as harmonies, both being from eternity. Dubitari non debet, quia ejus prædestinatio et præscientia non discordant, sed sicut præscit, ita quoque prædestinat; he referred, however, the one as well as the other in the first instance to that which is good. He regarded prescience as the result of predestination, foreknowledge not being in his opinion derived from things which are to exist, but things which exist being derived from foreknowledge. He placed sin in the permission of God, and in this sense admitted a predestination of it; at the same time he denied that evil did proceed from God, regarding it as simply a negative, the absence of good. "Everything positive," says he, "comes from God, but evil is a negative thing. Even in evil actions all that is positive comes from Him, but not evil, which consists just in the want of that *rectitudo voluntatis* which comes from God." In some points Anselm differs from Augustine, calling the proposition *non esse liberum arbitrium nisi ad mala* absurd, and he endeavours to hold the doctrine of the freedom of the will together with that of predestination. He cannot be said to be consistent in his teaching, and his attempt to reconcile divine predestination with the freedom of the human will is certainly not a success.

Alexander of Hales, the Irrefragable Doctor, introduced into the theology of Scholasticism the notion of fate which he defined to be the co-operation of all causes directed by a higher law. He

[1] Hampden's *Bampton Lectures*, Lect. VI.

looked upon freewill and fate as standing in no opposition to each other, for understanding by fate merely the co-operation of all causes by a higher law, he regarded freewill as one of the co-operating causes, dissenting from Augustine on this point. Foreknowledge, in so far as it is the *exemplaris ratio* in the *arte divina*, he calls *providentia*, in so far as it exhibits itself in *re vel effectu operis* he calls it *fatum*. He considered that the measure of grace received by the soul was entirely conditioned by the willingness or otherwise of the soul to receive it. He taught that all causes, free and natural, work together in their proper relations, and the actions of the freewill are only controlled by the connection in which they stand to other causes from outstepping the limits prescribed by Divine Providence.

He is followed by Albertus Magnus, who regards Divine Providence as the primal ground and original type of all that is done or can be done, and fate as the orderly arrangement originating in Providence which is stamped on the whole series of created things and reveals itself in the connections of natural and voluntary causes. He makes fate stand in relation to Providence as antitype to type, as the form actually incorporated in things to formative cause. Freewill, though subordinate to fate, does not lose its causality, and so the same effects, under different relations, spring from Providence, from fate, and from freewill.

Peter Lombard, the Master of the Sentences, who died in 1164, rests predestination on the absolute choice of the Almighty and reprobation on the sin of the creature. He makes use of the distinction of composite and divided sensation to explain in what sense it may be said that none of the predestinated persons can be lost nor any of the reprobate saved.

He differed from Anselm in not regarding prescience as the result of predestination. He admitted that the latter could not operate apart from the former, but he considered prescience to be quite possible apart from predestination, for, as he put it, through predestination God foresees the good He will Himself effect, by His prescience He simply foresees the evil which others will accomplish. He draws the important distinction between iniquity and its punishment; the former he denies to be predestinated but admits to be foreseen, the latter he admits to be predestinated, the iniquity being foreseen.

We find that the majority of the Schoolmen revolted at the idea of predestination to evil. Regarding, as they mostly did, predestination to be the result of the Will of the Almighty, the admission would have led them into the position of attributing evil to the Will of God. The final cause or end of all actions of the Divine Being could in their view be only goodness, and so far as all things done in the universe were the actions of God, or the result of His Will, they could only be referred to the great law of good inherent

in the nature of the Supreme Being. Evil could not be conceived to be the object of will at all according to their philosophy; much less the object of the perfect will of the Almighty. To meet the circumstances actually presented to their experience, or revealed in the letter of the Word, they were willing to assent to the proposition that the wicked were predestinated to *punishment*, but at the same time repudiated the idea that they were predestinated to the *evil* committed by them. Punishment was the result of the improper exercise of their own wills by which they missed the good designed for them by God.

It must be remembered that the Scholastic idea of punishment followed the Platonic and Aristotelian notion of it, that is, that it was a blessing to those to whom it was dispensed. It was regarded as purifying and as a means ordained for an end that was good. No doubt to this notion we may in part attribute the development of the idea of purgatory.

That evil was permitted by God the Schoolmen were prepared to admit, qualifying the admission by the end thereof, namely, that He might educe out of it ultimate good. Reprobation, in the Calvinistic sense, did not find a place in their theology. We do not find that they ever employ the terms to denote an antecedent will on the part of the Almighty of the sin and misery of the wicked. In fact, as it has been pointed out by Dr. Hampden,[1] such a position would have been opposed to the very philosophy from which they drew their speculations. The writer just quoted well points out that the theory of predestination proper is not at all concerned with the explaining the origin of evil. It is only, as he says, a theory of God's mercy in Christ deduced from its originating cause in the being of God, while a theory of reprobation on the other hand is a theory of the origin of evil.

Thomas Aquinas,[2] the great exponent of the Schoolmen and the most illustrious, certainly accepted all Augustine's doctrine on the subject of predestination, but he qualified it in a marvellous way. Philosophy was brought to throw light on Theology, and in the skilful hands of the learned doctor strange was the result. The older idea of the providence of God extending itself to all things was explained to be that God was the author and producer of every thought, action, or motion, producing each according to its own peculiar constitution, so that He was the first and immediate cause of everything, and in order to explain the joint production of everything by God as the first, and by the creature as the second cause, he taught that by a physical influence the will was predetermined by God to all things whether good or evil, so that

[1] *Bampton Lectures*, Lect. IV.

[2] Thomas Aquinas was a Dominican Friar so noted for his learning as to obtain the name of *Doctor Universalis*, or *Angelicus*. He was born in Italy in 1224 and died in 1274. His most famous work is his *Summa Theologiæ*. His followers are usually termed *Thomists*.

the will could not be said to be free in that particular instance *in sensu composito*, though it was in general still free in all its actions *in sensu diviso*, a distinction made much of by the Schoolmen. In natural things he considered that God works so as to communicate to them the power of activity and in the freewill so as to impart to it the power to act, and that under God's agency the freewill is active, but still the determination and the end of the action stands in the freewill; therefore the control over its own actions remains to it, though not so as in the case of the first cause. In short, though Aquinas desired to make as much show as possible in favour of the freedom of the will, he did not in fact admit any independent causality to it as an attribute. To avoid making God the author of sin, an effect which these views have on the face of them, a distinction was drawn between the positive act of sin, which was said not to be evil, and the want of its conformity to the law of God, which, being a negation, could have no positive being, and therefore could not be produced. And thus, though the action was produced jointly by God as the first cause, and by the creature as the second, yet not God but only the creature was guilty of the sin.[1] He looked upon evil as necessary in order to the completion of the universe in its manifoldness, considering the universe more complete if men were capable of falling from goodness than if they were not, on the ground that it was part of Providence not to destroy nature but to preserve it. He would not admit a predestination of guilt, not being able to separate this from the presence of evil in the Divine mind. Duns Scotus held the doctrine of predestination in a somewhat loose way. He endeavoured to reconcile his rather broad views of the power of freewill with that of necessity by representing that the Divine decree was not anticipatory as to time, but was immediately related to the action of the created will. He considered that only will could affect will, and was led to a rigid theory concerning the operation of Divine grace.

Approaching nearer to the era of the Reformation, we find the Dominicans and Augustines asserting Augustine's doctrine and contending for the irresistibility of Divine grace, while the Franciscans, and later the Jesuits, maintained opposite views, but admitted a preventing grace such as was subject to the freedom of the human will.

In 1588, Molina the Jesuit took up the question of *grace* and *freewill*, and in his Discourse *de concordia liberi arbitrii et gratiæ* carried his views to the utmost extreme. He taught that "freewill *without the aid of grace* can produce morally good works; that it can withstand temptation; that it can even elevate itself to this and the other acts of faith, hope, love, and repentance. When a man has advanced far God *then* bestows grace upon him

[1] See Burnet *on the 39 Articles*, Ed. 1837, p. 199.

on account of Christ's merits, by means of which grace he experiences the supernatural effects of sanctification; yet, as before this grace had been received so afterwards freewill always holds a *determining* place." Nothing which ascribes election to God could well stand with such a system. The subject was brought before Pope Clement VIII. in 1596, and 65 meetings and 37 disputations were held in his presence.[1] Clement died before any resolution was settled, and his successor, Paul V., who is by some said to have come to this decision by reason of the firm adherence of the Jesuits to the papal authority in the quarrel then waging between that authority and the Venetians, declined to conclude the point and commanded all sides to preserve silence on the questions at issue.

This advice was certainly followed to some extent, for the respective parties did modify their expressions used in enunciating their doctrine. And this action on their part was no doubt necessary to disarm, as far as possible, outside opposition, which was then coming to a head, and to avoid the reproach which was made to the Jesuit doctrine that it was tinctured with Pelagianism, and to the Dominican doctrine that it was tinctured with what was termed Protestant heresy, the reformed Churches of the Continent having mostly adopted Calvin's views on this subject. This view is confirmed by a letter written by Claudius Aquaviva, General of the Jesuits, in 1613, addressed to all the members of his order. He cautiously modifies the doctrine of Molina, and enjoins the society to teach everywhere the doctrine which represents the Supreme Being as electing freely to eternal life, without any regard to their merits, those whom He has been pleased to render partakers of that inestimable blessing; but at the same time exhorts them to inculcate this doctrine in such a manner as not to give up the tenets relating to divine grace which they had maintained in their controversy with the Dominicans.

On the other hand the Dominicans adopted certain terms and expressions for the enunciation of their doctrine, which gave it the appearance of a nearer approach to that of their opponents than it had in reality, so much so that they were reproached with their change of front, by the Jansenists, who arose about this time, and accused of a manifest and notorious apostacy from divine truth.[2]

The difference between the doctrine of grace as held by the Dominicans and by the Jansenists was, in truth, merely verbal, yet it was a difference which led the former into an inconsistency. For

[1] The Pope chose a Council known as the Congregation de Auxiliis, composed of 15 Cardinals, 9 Professors of Divinity, and 5 Bishops, which assembled during the course of 3 years from 20th March, 1602, to 22nd January, 1605, and at these sittings the Pope heard at one time the Jesuits, who supported the views of Molina, and the Dominicans, who opposed them, and at other sittings the assembled Council had to weigh the reasons of the contending parties and to examine their respective proofs.

[2] See Lettres Provinciales of Pascal, lit. ii.

instance, they agreed with the Jansenists as to a *sufficient* grace being given to all men, but they insisted that man could never act with this alone, and that it was still necessary for God to bestow an *efficacious* grace really to influence the will, and that this efficacious grace was not bestowed upon all. The inconsistency lies in this, that they make this grace at once sufficient and insufficient, for if it be sufficient, nothing more is requisite to produce the action, and if not, it cannot be called sufficient. In truth the only real distinction between the Dominicans and the Jansenists is that the former acknowledge that all men have sufficient grace, but hold that in order to act we must possess efficacious grace which is not given to all; while the Jansenists affirm that no grace is actually sufficient unless it be also efficacious, that is, that all those principles which do not determine the will to act effectively are insufficient for action, because they say no one can act without efficacious grace.

Verbally the Dominicans agreed with the Jesuits but substantially they were in agreement with the Jansenists. The views of the Jesuits were clear. They maintained that there is a general grace bestowed upon all mankind, but in a sense subordinated to freewill; that this grace is rendered efficacious or inefficacious, as the will chooses, without any additional assistance from God, and without needing anything exterior to itself to make its operations effectual; and on this account they distinguished it by the epithet *sufficient.* It will be seen that the term *sufficient* grace, as used by the Jesuits and Dominicans, is widely different.

In 1640 was published the celebrated work of Cornelius Jansen, Bishop of Ypres,[1] entitled "Augustinus," which again revived the disputes between the Dominicans, Franciscans, and Jesuits. The work is divided into three parts—the first is historical, containing an account of the Pelagian controversy the second embraces an accurate account and illustration of the views and doctrine of Augustine relating to the constitution and powers of human nature in its original, fallen, and renewed state; and the third contains

[1] He was born in 1585 at Leerdam, a small town in Holland, and studied at the University of Louvain, where he, in 1619 (Oct. 24), received a Doctor's Degree. He died of the Plague, 7th May, 1638, two years before the publication of his famous book. Jansen seems first to have imbibed his extreme views of efficacious grace from Janson, a follower of Baius, a Professor of Theology at Louvain, whose teaching had been condemned by a Bull of Pius V. in 1570, and afterwards by another Bull of Gregory XIII. in 1579. But he professed to found his views entirely on St. Augustine, whose works he is said to have read through ten times and his books against Pelagius thirty times. He received much valuable assistance from John du Verger, Abbot of St. Cyran. One of Jansen's works, entitled "Mars Gallicus," gave mortal offence to Cardinal Richelieu, and even in his lifetime he was much persecuted. The obloquy which immediately on his death was cast on his memory by the Romans was no doubt owing in a great measure to the action of Jansen's executors. They suppressed the letter which with his dying hand he wrote to Pope Urban VIII., submitting his unpublished work to his inspection, and also his will, which he dictated half an hour before his death. In his letter he gave the whole manuscript to the decision of the Pope, and authorized him to alter or to rescind any part of it. "The expressions of St. Augustine," said he, "are peculiarly profound. The vari-

the Augustinian doctrine relating to the aids of sanctifying grace procured by Christ, and the doctrine of eternal predestination of men and angels.

Jansen did not write with the object of giving his own private sentiments but of showing what was the teaching of the great bishop whose name and authority were universally revered throughout the Church.[1] He simply laid down what Augustine had previously taught, that efficacious grace by which the will is infallibly but without necessity applied and determined to act is necessary to all good actions and to prayer itself; and that in the fallen condition there is no sufficient grace in the sense asserted by Molina. He did not hesitate to state the result of the doctrine he held. He taught that there was a twofold Divine assistance, the one he terms an *adjutorium sine quo non*, without which we cannot act, the other an *adjutorium quo*, by which we act. The first he makes to be habitual, preparatory, and potential, and the means whereby the powers of the soul are prepared and fitted to act; the second he makes to be an actual influential assistance determining the will to act. The former potential habitual assistance he supposes to be in the same rank with the power or faculty for whose assistance they are given, for out of them and the power which they inform one entire complete operative faculty is constituted; whence the power clothed with or informed by these habitual assistances receives the denomination of an actus primus, or first act, which gives not the will but only a complete power of willing and doing. Amongst these assistances he reckons all habits or powers as intelligible species or ideas, and the light of intelligence, commonly styled intellectual habits, as all moral habits and preparatory graces seated in the will.

As for the *adjutorium quo*, the actual assistance, he taught that both the will and the freedom of the will as to whatever is morally good depends immediately and wholly on the actual assistance or concourse of efficacious grace, asserting that no motion or act of the will can be morally good without the concurrence of

ous modes in which his writings have been interpreted prove at once the difficulty of the exposition and the incompetence of the expositors. Whether I have been more fortunate, which I speak according to truth, or whether I am deluded by my own confidence, can only be known by submitting my whole work to the test, to that true and infallible light before which the illusive glare of false splendour disappears: to that living touchstone, at whose touch everything is ground to powder which possesses not the solidity of truth . . . I therefore now lay my work at the feet of your holiness. I submit its contents implicitly to your decision, approving, condemning, adjudging, or rejecting whatever shall be prescribed by the decision of the Apostolic See." In his will he says—"Sunt aliquid difficilior mutari. Si tamen Romana sedes aliquid mutari velit, sine dubitatione faciat, et illius ecclesiæ in qua semper vivit usque ad hunc locum mortis obedientia sua, ita postrema voluntas mea est. Acta sent. Mali, 1668."

[1] Thus he expresses himself—Non ego hic de aliqua mea sententia experiendo loquor . . . . sed de antiqua Augustini. Quæritur, non quid de mannis humanis studiis et viribus, vel de Dei gratia et predestinatione sentiendum sit, sed quid Augustinus, dum Ecclesiæ nomine et auctoritate tradebant, prædicaverit, semperque unanimiter asseruerit.—Augustinus, vol. 2 lib. Procemial, cap. XXIX.

efficacious grace. "We judge," says he,[1] "the opinion of St. Augustine and his disciples as indubitable, (1) That no good work, no act morally just can be performed by freewill unless it be freed by grace, and that not of every kind but of faith; (2) that the liberty of abstaining from sin is lost, and a necessity of sinning even in every act introduced, because whatever is not of faith is sin." Jansen thought that to men in their lapsed condition no *sufficient* grace is afforded but what is also *efficacious*, and his reason was that *sufficient* grace belonged to the grace of nature and was altogether unfitted for the reparation of fallen man. "It cannot be asserted since the fall," said he, "unless with a greater delusion than that of the Pelagians who take away original sin, we will allow to Nature unwounded force. Yea, what can be produced more monstrous than such a kind of assistance distinct from all the rest, which was never from the beginning of the fall nor shall be to the day of judgment conferred on the human will."[2]

Jansen goes on to assert that God is not bound by any law to give grace to him who does what he can by the force of nature to improve the abilities he has. "For," says he, "there is no law or ordination of God by which grace is conferred on sinners who do nothing good; but this is dispensed not only entirely freely but also according to the most profound laws of Divine Sovereignty, whereby grace is sometimes imparted to the most heinous sinner and denied to others more righteous."

His book contains many dissertations on freewill; and on the difficulty of reconciling it with efficacious grace he says—"The mode of reconciling Divine grace with freewill is so difficult to be discerned, according to Augustine, that when the liberty of the will is defended, the grace of God seems to be denied, and when the grace of God is asserted, the liberty of the will may be thought to be taken away. Hence Augustine, to manifest that the liberty of the will continues safe under grace, and that both might very well operate together in one, never attempted anything against the Pelagians, which excluded the will from an instrumental concurrence with the grace of God."[3] And again, "It cannot be but that the will must be free, therefore if grace enables and makes us to will it enables and makes us also to will *freely*, so that there can be no repugnance betwixt grace and the liberty of the will."[4]

As to predestination he lays down these propositions:—1. That the object of predestination is not things eternal but temporal. 2. That God's predestination regards His own affairs, things to be done by Him, not merely by others. For we decree things we are to do either by writing, commanding, or persuading, &c. 3. That God's decrees regard both the end and the means, for they

[1] Jansenius, *Augustinus*, vol. ii., lib. iii., cap. 4.
[2] *Ib.*, vol. iii., *de Grat.*, lib. iii., cap. 1, 2, 3.
[3] *Ib.*, lib. viii., cap. 6.
[4] *Ib.*, cap. 19.

include all God does. 4. Hence, also, it follows that children may be predestinated to glory without previous faith as well as adults by ordinate merits, for there is no difference in the decree. 5. That predestination regards not only good but also evil. Jansen goes on to show that predestination is not founded upon any prevision of merit, and to reject the distinction drawn by many between negative and positive reprobation, and proves that the former in reality includes the latter.[1]

Jansen's book immediately found favour in France and in Flanders. In France it was taken up by the majority of the Sorbonne and many of the Oratorian Priests of Cardinal Berull's Institution, and in Flanders by many of the University of Louvain, the Archbishop of Machelen, the Bishop of Gaunt, and others. It was however soon perceived by the Jesuits that the publication would be most detrimental to their cause by placing them in direct opposition to Augustine, and they accordingly left no means untried to procure its condemnation by the Papal See. In this they succeeded by, in the first place, having the perusal of the book prohibited by the Roman Inquisitors, and in the next place by inducing Urban VIII., in March, 1642, to issue a general condemnation of the work in the Bull "In eminenti," as a book infected with errors. This condemnation was however very far from reaching the end proposed—the overthrow of the system propounded in Jansen's work—and many distinguished men set at nought the papal bull by openly espousing the cause of Jansen.

Each party continued to defend their peculiar tenets with much zeal, and it was with no small degree of sophistry that the followers of Jansen contrived to evade the fury of the Jesuits, who were the more powerful party.

Matters growing daily worse and the heat of the parties increasing, the bishops, in their general assembly or Synod at Paris, in 1650, took the matter into consideration, and, having examined Jansen's book, they collected five propositions out of it which seemed to them to deserve censure. These propositions were—1. That there are divine precepts which good men, notwithstanding their desire to observe, are, nevertheless, absolutely unable to obey; nor has God given them that measure of grace that is essentially necessary to render them capable of such obedience. 2. That no person, in his corrupt state of nature, can resist the influence of divine grace when it operates upon the mind. 3. That in order to render human actions meritorious, or otherwise, it is not requisite that they be exempt from necessity, but only that they be free from constraint. 4. That the Semi-Pelagians admitted preventing grace to be necessary to every good action; and their heresy consisted in this, that they allowed the human will to be endowed with the power of either resisting that grace or of complying with

[1] *Ib.*, lib. x., cap. 3.

its influence.[1] 5. That whosoever affirms that Jesus Christ made expiation by His suffering and death for the sins of *all* mankind is a Semi-Pelagian.

These propositions the bishops sent to Pope Innocent X., humbly requesting that he would determine what ought to be held. The petition was signed by 85 bishops who were present at the Synod. After two years examination and consideration, during which both parties were heard in favour of their respective views, the Pope defined the five propositions to be heretical, and condemned them as rash, impious, and blasphemous by his Bull, given on the 31st May, 1653.[2]

An ingenious device was set up upon the issuing of this Bull by means of which the Jansenists were able to maintain their view and yet remain within the pale of the Roman Church. This was by subscribing to the correctness of the Pope's decision respecting the propositions, which was the *questio de jure.* The other by

[1] Mastricht cites this 4th proposition slightly differently: "Semi-Pelagiani admittebant prævenientis gratiæ interioris necessitatem ad singulos actus, etiam ad initium fidei; et in hoc erant hæretici, quod vellent, eam gratiam talem esse cui posset humana voluntas resistere, vel obtemperare."—Oper. 1176, Amstel. 1724.

[2] As this and the subsequent Bull on the same subject are interesting documents and not easily to be met with they will be set forth. The Bull of Innocent X. is as follows:

"Innocent Bishop, Servant of the Servants of God, To all Faithful Christians health and apostolical benediction, Whereas upon occasion of Printing a Book entituled 'Augustinus Cornelii Jansenii Yprensis Episcopi,' among other opinions of that author, there arose a dispute principally in France touching five of them. Many bishops of that Realm have very much pressed us to examine those five propositions presented unto us, and to pronounce a certain and clear judgment on each of them in particular. The tenour of the said propositions is as follows: [*Here the five propositions are set out.*] We who amidst the manifold cares which continually exercise our mind make it our principal one that the Church of God committed to us from above, being cleansed from the errors of perverse opinions may safely pass the warfare, and, like a ship in a calm sea, the waves and storms of all tempests being allayed may securely sail and arrive in the wished for haven of salvation; taking into consideration the importance of the matter, have caused the five propositions presented to us in the terms above expressed to be diligently examined one after another by many Doctors of the Sacred Faculty of Theology in the presence of sundry Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church for that purpose specially assembled, whose suffrages we have maturely considered, upon report thereof made to us as well verbally as in writing. And we have heard the same doctors in several assemblies in our presence largely discoursing upon them and every of them. And whereas from the beginning of this discussion we enjoined both publicly and privately the prayers of many faithful Christians to be made for the obtaining of Divine assistance; afterwards we caused the same to be reiterated with greater fervour; and having ourself solicitously implored the assistance of the Holy Ghost, at length by the favour of that Divine Spirit we have proceeded to the following declaration and decision:

"The first of the said propositions, namely, That some of the Commandments of God &c., we declare to be rash, impious, blasphemous, anathematized, and heretical, and condemn it as such:

"The second, namely, That in the state of corrupt nature &c., we declare to be heretical, and condemn it as such:

"The third, namely, That to merit and demerit &c., we declare to be heretical, and condemn it as such:

"The fourth, namely, That the Semi-Pelagians admitted &c., we declare to be false and heretical, and condemn it as such:

"The fifth, namely, That it is Semi-Pelagianism &c., we declare to be false, rash, scandalous and being understood in the sense that Christ died only for the salvation of the predestinate, we declare to be impious, blasphemous, contumelious, derogatory to Divine goodness and heretical, and condemn it as such:

"Wherefore we command all faithful Christians of either sex that concerning the said propositions they neither presume to believe, teach, nor preach otherwise than is con-

denying that these propositions were in Jansen's book, on the ground that the Pope had not declared himself on this point; this was the *questio de facto.* They did not however long enjoy this ingenious distinction, for Innocent X., September 29, 1654, decreed that the five propositions were to be found in Jansen's book. The Jansenists now started a different defence—they denied the Papal authority to extend the infallible decrees to points of *fact*, and in this they were certainly borne out by some of the highest Romish authorities.

They admitted the Pope's right in doctrinal judgments, acknowledging that God guided His Church infallibly, but where supernatural judgment was not needed they held that the Pope might be wrong. Alexander VII., on the 16th October, 1656, issued a further Bull, in which it was positively declared that the five propositions were the tenets of Jansen and were to be found in his book.[1]

tained in our present declaration and definition under the censures and penalties ordained in the Law against heretics and their abettors. We likewise enjoin all Patriarchs, Archbishops, Bishops, and other Ordinaries of Places, as also the Inquisitors of Heresy that they restrain and repress all the contraditors and rebels whatsoever by the aforesaid censures and penalties and by other fitting remedies by law, fact, and usage, the help also of the secular power being called in hereunto if need be.

"We do not intend nevertheless by this declaration and definition made upon the five propositions aforesaid, any way to approve other opinions which are contained in the aforesaid book of Cornelius Jansen.

"Given at Rome, at St. Mary Major, in the year of our Lord 1653, the day before the calends of June, the ninth year of our Pontificate.

"G. GUALTORIUS.
"Hi. Datarius P. CAMPINIUS."

[1] The following is a copy of the Bull:—

"Alexander, Bishop, Servant of the Servants of God, To all Faithful Christians health and Apostolic Benediction.

"The Divine Providence having by an inscrutable dispensation and without any merit on our part raised us to the sacred throne of St. Peter and to the government of the whole Church, we have judged it to concern the duty of our Pastoral charge to make it our principal endeavour, by virtue of that power and authority which God has given us, seasonably to provide for the safety and integrity of the Holy Faith and of its sacred decisions. And although such points as have already been most sufficiently defined by Apostolic Constitutions, stand not in need of any new decision or declaration, yet in regard that some disturbers of the public peace are not afraid to call them in question, or to shake and weaken them by their subtle and captious interpretations, We to prevent the further spreading of so dangerous a contagion, have thought it fit not to defer any longer to apply the speedy remedy of the Apostolical authority. For indeed our Fredecessor Innocent the Tenth of happy memory did some few years since set forth a Constitution, declaration and Decision in form and tenour following [*Here is set forth the Bull of Innocent X. given p.* 41]. But for so much as some children of iniquity (as we have been informed) are not afraid to maintain (to the great scandal of the faithful) that the aforesaid five propositions are not to be found in the forecited Book of the said Cornelius Jansen, but are either feigned and forged at pleasure, or were not condemned in the sense intended by the Author; We, who have seriously and sufficiently considered what ever has passed concerning this matter (as having by command of the said Pope Innocent the Tenth, our predecessor, while we were yet but in the dignity of Cardinalship assisted at all the Conferences, wherein by Apostolical authority the same cause has been examined with as great diligence as could be desired), being resolved to remove and take away all doubts that might at any time hereafter arise touching the premises, to the end that all faithful Christians may be held in the unity of the same faith. We, I say, by the duty of our pastoral charge and upon mature deliberation, do confirm approve and renew by these presents the above recited Constitution Declaration and Definition of Pope Innocent, our predecessor; and we further declare and define, That those five propositions were drawn out of the book of the same Cornelius Jansen, Bishop of Ypres,

The contention between the Jesuits and Jansenists continued for many years, and the former, in the year 1665, obtained a Bull from the Pope for the imposing of a submission of faith which was on the 29th April, 1665, ratified by a declaration of the King of France.[1]

This Bull, with the declaration, was violently opposed by many in France who were not one with the Jansenists in their views on predestination and grace, and produced most deplorable results. Some of the Jansenists declined either to subscribe or reject the declaration, but declared that in veneration for the Papal authority they would observe a profound silence. Others consented to sign it with a reservation and being allowed to explain, either verbally or in writing, the sense in which they understood it. Others employed methods to evade the declaration, but all in vain. Nothing would appease the Jesuits but submission. They set upon their opponents with such fury and persecution that those who made

entitled 'Augustinus,' as also that they were condemned in the sense intended by the same Cornelius: and as such we condemn them anew, applying to them the same censure, wherewith every one of them was particularly branded in the forementioned Declaration and Definition. And we again condemn and prohibit the same Book of the so oft recited Cornelius Jansen, entitled 'Augustinus,' and all other books as well as manuscripts, printed or which may hereafter happen to be printed, wherein the above condemned doctrine of the same Cornelius Jansen is or shall be defended, asserted, or maintained. *Prohibiting* all faithful Christians to hold, preach, teach, or expound the said doctrine either by word or writing, or to interpret it either in public or in private, or to cause it to be printed either openly or in secret: and this under the penalties and censures specified in the Law against heretics instantly to be incurred *ipso facto* without further declaration.

"Wherefore we enjoin all our Venerable Brethren, Patriarchs, Primates, Metropolitans, Archbishops, Bishops, Ordinaries of places, Inquisitors of Heresy and all other Judges Ecclesiastical, to whom it shall belong, to cause this above said Constitution, Declaration, and Definition of Pope Innocent, our predecessor, to be observed according to our present determination and to restrain and punish all disobedient and rebellious persons by the aforesaid penalties, and other remedies *juris et facti* even by imploring the assistance of the secular arm, if it shall be necessary.

"Given at Rome, at St. Mary Major, the 16th of October, in the year of our Lord God 1656 and of our Pontificate the second."

[1] The following is the Bull:—

"Alexander, Bishop, Servant of the Servants of God, for perpetual memory.

"The reason of Apostolical government by Divine Providence committed to me, though undeserving, requires that we apply our whole mind and care, so far as we may in the Lord, unto such matters chiefly as are most conducible to the conservation and propagation of the Catholic Religion, to the salvation of souls, and to the repose of believers. It was from the Intuition hereof that we endeavoured, the second year of our Pontificate, by an express constitution published by us with this object, to put an end to the heresy of Cornelius Jansen, which spread itself principally in France and which after it had been well nigh stifled by Innocent X., our predecessor of happy memory, ceased not as a serpent whose head is broken to make fresh efforts, and to appear willing to save itself by its ordinary turnings and windings. But as the enemy of mankind has an infinite number of artifices to hinder the success of good designs, our endeavour (whose only aim was to oblige all those who have erred to re-enter into the way of salvation) have not had the issue we desired; notwithstanding our desires have been happily seconded by the pains and care with which our Venerable Brethren the Archbishops and Bishops of the Kingdom of France have applied themselves, so far as they could, to cause the said Apostolical Constitution to be executed; and by the singular piety of our very dear son in our Lord the most Christian King, who has for the same purpose afforded us the succour of his hand, with an extraordinary vigour and constancy. Moreover the most Christian King, being induced by the zeal he has for religion to remonstrate to us by his ambassador, that the best remedy to extirpate the roots of this contagious malady is to cause all the

the least opposition to the Papal declaration were cast into prison or banished. Some escaped by flight and took refuge under the wings of the Dutch government, whence they were able to smile at the storm and defy the persecuting fury of their enemies.

In the year 1669 an organized opposition was made to the declaration. The Bishops of Angers, Beauvais, Pamiers, and Alet distinctly refused to subscribe it without certain distinctions and explanations, and so soon as they were threatened from Rome, 19 other bishops adopted their cause and solemnly remonstrated with the King of France and the Roman Pontiff. Moved by these indications of a determined resistance and by the influence of Anne Genevieve de Bourbon Duke of Longueville, who had espoused the cause of the Jansenists, Clement IX. agreed to accept a conditional subscription to the declaration and to permit doctors of scrupulous conscience to sign it according to the mental interpretation which each thought proper to give to it.

This act of condescension on the part of the Pope is known as the Peace of Clement IX.; its duration was but short, for in the year 1676, at the instigation of the Jesuits, Lewis XIV. declared in a public edict that it had only been granted for a time out of indulgence to the tender consciences of a certain number of persons. Upon this the misfortunes of the Jansenists recommenced, and they were pursued with bitter malignity by their old enemies. The cruelties exercised on the nuns of Port Royal who refused to condemn what was in fact the doctrine of Augustine—their dispersion in 1709 and the bitter repentance of their chief persecutor, Cardinal de Noailles—are well known matters of history. The Jansenists still exist as a separate body to this day in Holland, having their own bishops and archbishop, the latter known as the Archbishop of Utrecht.

Most of those who protested against the pretentions of the Papacy, both abroad and in this country prior to the Reformation, held views similar to Augustine on the doctrine of predestination, and many enunciated them in terms stronger if possible than Calvin himself. This was the case with John Huss, the Bohemian Martyr (who was burned in 1415), as may be seen from his appeal in Fox's Acts and Monuments.[1] Indeed he was charged by the Council of Constance with being a fatalist. Amongst the condemned articles we find—

world to sign one formulary founded on our authority. In pursuance whereof we command all Ecclesiastics &c. to subscribe the following formulary :-

"I. N. submit myself to the Apostolical Constitution of Innocent X., dated May 31st, 1653, and to the Constitution of Alexander VII., dated October 16th, 1656, the chief Bishops; and I do with a sincere mind reject and condemn the five propositions taken out of Cornelius Jansen's book, named 'Augustinus,' and in the sense intended by the same author, as the Apostolic See has by the said Constitutions condemned them. And thus I swear. God so help me, and these holy Evangelists of God.

"Given at Rome, February 15th, 1665."

[1] Vol. I., pp. 695, 696.

3. The prescite are not parts of the Church, since no part of it will finally fall off from it, because the charity of predestination which binds it will not fall off.

5. The prescitus, though he is sometimes in grace according to present justice, yet is never part of the Church, and the predestined always remains a member of the Church, although he may sometimes fall away from adventitious grace, but not from the grace of predestination.

6. Taking the Church for the convocation of the predestined, whether they be in grace or not according to present righteousness, in that way the Church is an article of faith.

21. The grace of predestination is a bond by which the body of the Church and every member of it is indissolubly joined to Christ the Head.

He was followed by Jerome of Prague, who suffered martyrdom in 1416.

So amongst the charges made against John de Wesalia, in 1479, we find these: "That God has from eternity written a book, wherein He has inscribed all His elect, and whosoever is not already written therein will never be written there at all. Moreover, he that is written therein will never be blotted out of it." "That the elect are saved by the grace of God alone, and whosoever God wills to save, by enduing him with grace, if all the priests in the world were desirous to damn and excommunicate he would still be saved."[1]

So we find that Wycliffe was a strong Predestinarian and an absolute Necessitarian. He attempted to reconcile human freedom with the Divine causality by saying that a man is like a child in leading-strings who at the same time freely uses his own limbs. The eternal purpose gives a direction to human nature and its dispositions, but the individual acts of man are free. He acknowledged God to be the efficient cause of all good, and as to evil thought that being negative only and having no real existence, this must not be ascribed to Divine causality. Amongst his errors condemned by the Council of Constance we find the following:

26. The prayer of a reprobate avails no one.

27. All things happen from absolute necessity.

Bradwardine, Archbishop of Canterbury, as early as the middle of the fourteenth century, actually wrote an elaborate treatise, entitled "De Causa Dei contra Pelagium," intended to demonstrate the absoluteness both of Providence and grace. He has a chapter proving Quod res scitæ non sunt causæ Divinæ scientiæ, or that "The things known are not the foundation of God's knowing them."

[1] Deus, ab æterno, condidit librum, in quem scripsit omnes suos electos. Quicumque autem in eo non est scriptus, numquam inscribetur, in ipsum in æternum. Et qui in eo scriptus est, nunquam ex eo delebitur. Sola Dei gratia salvantur electi. Et quem Deus vult salvare, donando sibi gratiam, si omnes sacerdotes vellent illum damnare aut excommunicare, adhuc salvaretur ille.—Fascic. Rerum, vol. I., p. 325.

The substance of his reasoning is as follows:—Knowledge is a principal perfection in God. If, therefore, His knowledge were derived from the objects with which it is conversant, it would follow that God is indebted, for part of His perfection, to some other source than Himself, in which case He must cease to be self-perfect. He would, moreover, cease to be all sufficient of Himself, for He would stand in need of created help to render His knowledge complete. His omniscience would be forced to ask assistance from the very things it comprehends; and how could His essential glory be matchless and unrivalled if any portion of it was dependent on assistance borrowed from without? Add to this, that if the things which God knows are themselves the producing cause of His knowing them, they must be antecedent to His knowledge either in commencement of existence or in order of nature. But they are not prior to His knowledge in either of these respects, for they are all created in time, whereas God and His knowledge are eternal.[1] He therefore concluded that the knowledge of God is a cause of the things known and not *vice versâ*, and on the same principle looked upon predestination as the only ground upon which the Divine foreknowledge and providence could stand. He considered that neither persons nor things nor events could have any certainty nor be foreknown apart from the will and purpose of God, and accordingly defines predestination to be neither more nor less than Æterna Prævolutio Dei, sive Præordinatio voluntatis Divinæ, circa futurum: God's eternal prevolition, or predetermination of His will, respecting what shall come to pass.[2] He admits the human will to be free but regards it as not altogether exempt from necessity. He considers that what the understanding regards as good the will must *necessarily* desire; and what the understanding represents as evil the will must necessarily disapprove. He holds the view that the human will cannot so much as conquer a single temptation, even after God's regenerating power has passed upon the soul, *sine alio Dei auxilio speciali*, without a fresh supply of God's particular assistance; which particular assistance he defines to be voluntas Dei invicta, the supernatural influence, resulting from the unconquerable will of God. Were this not the case he argues that the number of the elect and predestinate would depend more upon man than upon God. Men, by antecedently and causally disposing their own wills to this or that, would leave God no more to do than to regulate His afterdecrees in a subservient conformity to the prior determinations of

[1] Scire namque est magnæ perfectionis in Deo. Si ergo scientia Dei causetur a scitis, ipse recipit perfectionem ab alio. Ergo, non est ex se summe perfectus. Item tunc non esset per se sufficientissimus; indigeret enim scitis a quibus posset suffragia suæ scientiæ mendicare. Quomodo ergo erit incomparabiliter gloriosus, qui mendicatis suffragiis gloriatur . . . . Item, si scita essent causæ effectivæ Divinæ scientiæ, præcederent illa, Tempore, vel Natura. Sed quomodo, cum ista sint temporalia, hæc æterna?—De Causa Dei, lib. i., cap. xv.

[2] *Ibid*, lib. i., cap. xlv.

His creatures, and in a way of subjection and subordination to their will and pleasure.[1]

Luther at first espoused Augustine's opinions heartily, for he perceived how they afforded him great scope in his contention against the doctrine of merit and justification by works. He went so far as to repudiate all freedom on the part of man, asserting that his will was enslaved. He wrote a treatise, which he entitled *De servo arbitrio*, in support of his views, in which he alleged that man in his actings towards God is the captive, the subject, and the servant either of the will of God or the will of Satan. He considered that all things which we do, although they may appear to us to be done mutably and contingently, and even may be done thus contingently by us, are yet in reality done necessarily and immutably with respect to the will of God. He objected, however, to the term *necessity*, as applied to the human will or the Divine, on the ground of its being too harsh and ill suited for the subject, involving as it does the idea of compulsion; and he even attributes to man what he calls a real will, that is, not a mere seeming causality. But as he makes God the all determining causality, the freewill he allows to man is little better than an empty name. In fact, he practically admits this, in one place saying "If we believe that God foreknows and predestinates everything . . . . it follows that there can be no such thing as freewill in man or angel or any creature." He falls back upon the eternal divine foreknowledge and the omnipotent divine power and deduces therefrom that even as we were not created by ourselves so neither are we able to do anything of ourselves alone, but everything is done by God's Almighty power. In short, in magnifying the Divine omnipotence he nullifies its operation. "Since," says he, "God foresaw from eternity that we should be even thus, and has made us in consequence in every respect according to His foresight appointed, and at this very moment makes, impels, and governs us according thereto, say, good friend, what can we in any way call or imagine to be free in us? For this reason are God's eternal foresight and our freewill directly opposed to one another like fire and water. Either God fails in His foresight and errs in His working, which is impossible, or we must do and suffer ourselves to be done with as His eternal foresight and working intend." And again, "Yes, these two things, omnipotent power and eternal foresight, fundamentally destroy the freewill, so that not a hair of it even is left."

The controversy between Erasmus and Luther on the subject is well known. Both these great men were one-sided. They held the

[1]—Homines magis disponunt electos et prædestinatos in numero, quam faciat Deus ipse; nam antecedenter et causaliter quia homines disponunt voluntates suas, hoc modo, vel illo; ideo Deus, subservienter et subexecutive, disponit numerum electorum tantum vel tantum.—*Ib.*, lib. ii., cap. v.

particular truth they contended for, not in harmony with other truths equally clearly revealed in Holy Scripture, but in opposition to such truths, and both naturally went astray. Erasmus, seeing how necessary free agency is for human responsibility, overlooked the mischief done to man's moral nature by the entrance of sin. He defines freedom as the power of the human will in virtue of which it rests with it to turn itself to that which leads to good or to turn itself away from it. He does not mean simply that there is the susceptibility for the good, but that there is also the power of producing it out of itself. Thus he fails to give the proper place and effect to divine grace. On the other hand, Luther, in advocating the cause of God's grace, overlooks His righteousness. The latter does not give sufficient weight either to man's responsibility or to divine justice. In some parts of his treatise he makes man little better than a machine, and seems almost to make sin necessary. It is true he considers the human will does not act by compulsion but by inclination. "God," says he, "moves every power according to its nature."

Luther modified his views, as is well known, in after years, though this has been strenuously denied. He never distinctly retracted what he had written respecting the bondage of the will[1] and probably did not modify his views to the extent which some have endeavoured to make out. Melancthon, however, who at one time held similar views with Luther on the subject, did actually retract his,[2] and for this he was never blamed by Luther.

As to the doctrine of election, Luther looked upon it as the objective complement of the personal assurance of salvation, and this assurance of salvation (differing from Calvin, who rests it rather on the knowledge of eternal election, though it is true he does not postulate a knowledge of election otherwise than through faith in Christ) he derives from faith in Christ. He rests the Divine decrees respecting the salvation or misery of men on the foreknowledge of God, who, foreseeing from all eternity the faith or unbelief of different individuals reserved eternal happiness for the one and eternal misery for the other. Still he is by no means consistent. He draws a distinction between the *revealed* and the *secret* will of God. He lets His law and grace be proclaimed to all, but the secret will ordains who and how many are to be partakers of grace; a fatal error productive of much harm which he tries to make great use of. His conception of election is obviously inconsistent, as he admits the possibility of apostacy on the part of those who have obtained grace. Every cloud of mystery hang-

[1] In fact as late as 1537 he expressly declared that of all his works his treatise "De Servo Arbitrio" and his larger Catechism were the only ones which he then regarded as written with due care and accuracy.—See *post*.

[2] See *post*. His change of opinion gave rise to the synergistic controversy.

ing over the subject remains untouched by Luther, and in fact were but darkened by his own distinctions.[1]

Melancthon, in the first edition of the *Loci* in 1521, makes some assertions which go even further than Calvin, alleging that since all things happen necessarily according to the Divine predestination there is no such thing as liberty in our wills, that the Scriptures teach that all things happen necessarily, taking away liberty from our wills by the necessity of predestination. These assertions find no place in the subsequent editions of his work. In his edition of 1535 he calls the denial of freedom stoicism, proving from antiquity that the conscience remained and spoke and was even a propelling factor, and showing that the idea of guilt would suffer if, whether by reason of the Divine omnipotence or original sin, every moral factor on the side of the will were denied. In combating Laurentius Valla he admits the spiritual weapon of the will, but asserts that it is strengthened by the Word, to which it can cleave. He makes out that there are three co-operative causes of salvation, the Word, the Holy Spirit, and the Will; which last he shows does not remain idle but struggles against its weakness in such a way that God's call and helpful impulse precede the will, which merits nothing, but is only related instrumentally to salvation.

In 1543 we find Melancthon saying, "Man may pray for help and reject grace. Grace disposes man, and he must freely consent to it." He still holds to the fundamental truth of the entire depravity of human nature and the utter impotency of the will of man, as he is untouched by grace, to effect any spiritual good, though he had become persuaded that there might be some sort of co-operation or synergism of the human will with the grace of God even in the *first* movements towards conversion. He still, however, cannot be regarded as holding a view opposed to Calvin, but rather as holding the same view, according to his own expression in writing to Calvin "with a qualification." Indeed Calvin, in 1543, dedicated to him his "Defensio sanæ et orthodoxæ doctrinæ de servitute et liberatione humani arbitrii," and in the dedication spoke of Melancthon in the most eulogistic terms.

Among the confessions of faith composed prior to the time of Calvin, the first confession of Basle declares: Article 1, Therefore we confess that God has, before the creation of the world, elected all those to whom He will give the inheritance of eternal blessedness. Zwingle adopted this statement and pronounced decidedly in favour of predestination, inferring the doctrine however rather

[1] Illudit autem sese *Diatribe* ignorantia sua, dum nihil distinguit inter Deum prædicatum et absconditum, hoc est inter Verbum Dei et Deum ipsum. Multa facit Deus, quæ Verbo suo non ostendit nobis: Multa quoqua vult quæ Verbo suo non ostendit sese velle. Sic non vult mortem peccatoris, Verbo scilicet. *Vult autem illam voluntate illa imperscrutabili.—Opera.* iii., 189.

from the nature of God than from that of man, and proceeding upon speculative rather than upon moral principles.[1]

We must now turn our attention to the great Geneva Reformer. In 1536 he issued his *Institutio Christianæ Religionis,* which at once placed him in the foremost ranks of the reformers, and acquired for him a place almost unique in the theological world. In his great work Calvin brought out very prominently and ably the fundamental verities of the Christian faith, and it must be remembered that while the Institutes contain 80 chapters five only refer to what may be termed pure Calvinism. We propose to deal only with the doctrine expressed in the latter portion, which doctrine was supported at greater length and more in detail in two small treatises published by Calvin in 1552 and 1558. He adopted Augustine's doctrine in its harshest sense, and set it forth with logical deductions which Augustine had scarcely dared to hint at. He differed too from Augustine in not giving that force to the Sacrament of Baptism which the great father had given. Calvin put forth his views with that zeal, ability, and confidence for which he stood pre-eminent in his day. He taught that the everlasting condition of mankind was determined from all eternity by the unchangeable decree of the Almighty, and that this absolute decree was the only source of happiness or misery to every individual.

He taught that all the elect are saved by immutable decree, and that the reprobate are damned by a like immutable decree, a decree determined concerning them before the foundation of the world and utterly irrespective of the foreknowledge of God.[2] And further, that God's foreknowledge of the reprobation and damnation of the lost is but the result of His determination. Calvin feared the consequences of what had been the doctrine which the Church had previously more generally received, viz., that God's predestination was founded on His foreknowledge, and boldly took the untenable position that His predestination was not the result of His foreknowledge, but His foreknowledge of His predestination, in this respect following Anselm and Bradwardine. Election and reprobation were in his view correlatives. To elect is to select out of a number, those passed by are reprobate. The reprobate God created to destruction: and that wickedness might not be assigned as the cause of rejection, Paul had said,[3] "before they had done good or evil." They came to their destiny, according to

[1] The view given of Zwingle's opinion of this subject both by Mosheim and Milner is inaccurate.

[2] Aliis vita æterna, aliis damnatio æterna præordinatatur.—Inst. iii., xxv. 5. Quod ergo Scriptura clare ostendit dicimus æterno et immutabili consilio Deum semel constituisse, quos olim semel assumere vellet in salutem, quos rursum exitio devovere. Hoc consilium quoad electos in gratuita ejus misericordia fundatum esse asserimus, nullo humanæ dignitatis respectu: quos vero damnationi addicit, his justo quidem et irreprehensibili, sed incomprehensibili ipsius judicio, vitæ aditum præcludi.—Inst. iii., xxi. 7.

[3] Rom. ix. 11.

Calvin, by the freewill of God, and, that their destiny might be accomplished, God deprived them of the opportunity of hearing His word, or blinded or hardened their hearts by the preaching of it. It was all according to God's righteous but unsearchable judgment in order to show His glory through their condemnation. Calvin was not satisfied with a mere permission on the part of God that Adam should fall, and yet he seeks to devolve the guilt of the fall upon man. His reasoning is, Man falls because Providence so orders it, but he falls through his own fault. Accordingly the transgression was not effected by God, but was only assumed into the general ordering of the world as an element that existed for God, inasmuch as nothing could at all events become actual of which God had not decreed that it might. It is true that Calvin does in some passages regard the fall of man as actually ordained by God as a means of preparation to the divine act of predestination taken in the absolute and unconditional sense;[1] and consequently he has been claimed as a Supralapsarian, but he has many other passages which conclusively show he held to the Sublapsarian hypothesis, and it must be remembered that in Calvin's time difference on the particular point had not arisen. The tenets which peculiarly distinguish the system of Calvin are: The absolute and unconditional election or predestination of certain particular individuals to eternal salvation, and the equally absolute and unconditional reprobation of all the remaining part of mankind without respect of persons. To these fundamental principles must be added that which is inseparably connected with them, the irresistibility of divine grace and the absolute impossibility that the elect should fall from grace.

Beza has been described as being Calvino Calvinior, but there was not much difference between them in point of doctrine. The main distinction was in the view they took of the order of the Divine decrees in their bearing upon the fall, and some slight difference as to the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity—the extent of the atonement and the nature and import of justification. Beza, as representative of what is known as the Supralapsarian position, taught that we ought to conceive of God as *first* decreeing to manifest Himself by saving some men and consigning the rest to misery, then in sequence and subordination to this decree, resolving to create man and to permit him to fall into sin, thus making the object of the decree of predestination man or the human race, viewed as not yet created and fallen but simply as to be created. Calvin, as representative of the Sublapsarian school, on the other hand taught that we ought to conceive of God as *first* decreeing to create man and to permit him to fall, and *then* as resolving to save some men out of this fallen condition and to

[1] Arcanum Dei consilium, quo præordinatus fuerat hominis lapsus.—Calv., *de Prad.*, p. 607.

leave the rest to perish, thus stopping, as it were, before the fall and regarding the object of the decree of predestination, man, or the human race, viewed as already fallen into a state of misery and sin.

The Supralapsarian system is the most offensive. It is founded on abstract principles, and by it God necessarily appears as positively decreeing and appointing the fall, a position the Sublapsarians are able by their scheme to avoid. It is true that the latter admit that God unchangeably pre-ordained the fall, as well as every other event that has or shall come to pass, but they assert that they hold this doctrine so as not to involve the idea of God as the author of sin.

After the death of Luther, his followers, known as the Thuringian theologians, numbering among them Amsdorf, Flacius, Gallus, Wigand, and others, came into opposition with Melancthon and the so-called Meissen theologians on the soteriological question. Melancthon, as we have already shown, was unable to rest in the view he had originally adopted in common with Luther as to the complete bondage of the will and its utter inability in a moral aspect. At a conference of Leipsic, in 1548, he had distinctly affirmed that God drew to Himself and converted adults in such a manner that the powerful impression of His grace was accompanied with a certain correspondent action of their will. This was a position the rigid Lutherans looked upon as subversive of that absolute servitude of the will maintained by their master. Pfeffinger, following the lines of Melancthon, asserted that there is a certain cause in us why some hearken to the Word while others do not. He contended that grace was related to works in like measure as if a handsome score were paid for one, but he himself could only contribute a farthing. The work, which is God's alone, was confounded by Pfeffinger with the work which, after the operation of divine grace, is capable of being effected by man with the assisting grace of God. It is obvious that in the initial act of salvation God must work all and man can work nothing; he cannot even contribute, according to Pfeffinger's illustration, a single farthing. Yet in the *working out* of his salvation the human will must be active. The fundamental relation between grace and the powers of man was incorrectly defined, and the error of regarding the activity of man as originally not simply receptive but as a productive causality, differing only from the Divine working in degree, was a step certainly beyond what is warranted by anything in Melancthon's writings and, in fact, is seriously injurious to the true dependence of man on his God. Pfeffinger was immediately attacked by the Jena theologians, Flacius and Amsdorf, and hence arose what is known as the synergistical controversy.[1]

[1] It was so called as the controversy turned upon the co-operation of the human will with divine grace, from the Greek συνέργεια, co-operation.

"If," it was said, "the choice lies in man to comply with the Divine call or not, then there is naturally freewill for spiritual things (*liberum arbitrium in spiritualibus*), the doctrine of natural depravity is false, and man can of his own power prepare himself for grace. But man must much more by nature resist grace. If anyone, therefore, is saved, it is a pure work of grace without the intervention of the liberum arbitrium at any point."

A colloquy was instituted at Weimar, in 1560, when Flacius and Strigel, the friend and disciple of Melancthon, were the representatives of each party. Strigel asserted that the *liberum arbitrium* was only restricted and injured, but not altogether removed by original sin, and that if the restriction were only removed, the power for good revived of itself. He rejected both Pelagianism and Semi-Pelagianism with which he was charged, but alleged that the human will, when under the influence of divine grace leading it to repentance is not totally inactive; in fact bears a certain part in the salutary work of conversion. In his view, natural depravity was no corruption of the substance but only an accident attaching to the substance. To this Flacius replied that were this true, sin would be but mere external addition, whereas it had laid hold of and penetrated the substance; regeneration, too, would be a mere liberation of already existing, though dominant, powers for good. He assumed that holiness was a substance, and argued from that that original sin also must be regarded as a substance. As to the position and attitude of man in regard to grace, he considered that in its reception man occupied a position purely passive; nay, of himself he resisted grace and was converted while resisting it. Flacius was evidently an absolute Predestinarian, conceiving man as absolutely passive, nay more, positively repugnative to converting grace.

Strigel seems to attribute to unassisted nature too much and Flacius too little. The one regarded the fall of man as bringing him into a condition in which every virtuous tendency, every noble faculty had been extinguished in the mind, while the other looked upon its effect as by no means universal or entire, and certainly not as operative to prevent some degree of activity rendering it capable of attainment to virtue and goodness. Strigel clearly thought that man was capable of executing civil justice, and that he, though still in a fallen condition, possessed the capacity of turning towards redemption, and had consequently a real recipiency of a *spiritual kind*, and this was the essence of Synergism.

As Strigel subsequently put his declaration of doctrine into verbal accord with what was recognized as orthodox, he was acquitted and his opponent was now attacked. Flacius's idea that original sin is the very substance of human nature was condemned by the greater part of the Lutheran body as bearing too great a

similarity to the heresy of the Manicheans; still his views found support among some and were embraced by Cyriac, Spangenberg, Christopher Irenæus, and Cœlestine. He was apparently at first led into his error by an ignorance of philosophical distinctions, and, being of an obstinate nature, preferred rather to sacrifice himself and his cause, for the sake of an expression, than abandon an hypothesis into maintaining which he had perhaps been led unwittingly by the astuteness of his opponent.

The *Formula Concordiæ*[1] decided against the idea which allows the work of salvation to begin by means of good human powers of themselves, and also against the opinion that whilst God indeed must begin the work still man is only severely maimed and half dead, so that when the Holy Ghost has made the beginning he may aid, however little, in the work of conversion; in short, can co-operate with the Holy Ghost in effecting the work of salvation. It makes the work of salvation from its initial stage to its completion possible only through the communicative grace of God. It rejects the metaphysical denial of the *liberum arbitrium* as well as the opinion that sin is the substance of man and conversion an annihilation of that substance. The power of the human will, which the Holy Ghost sets free, or to which it communicates living activity, must co-operate, but by virtue of the communication or setting free the power is regarded as not of the natural man but of the spiritual. The operation of the Holy Ghost does not exclude the human act but rather induces it; consequently conversion is in every part, except the first impulse, the Divine and human work at the same time. We shall hereafter have an opportunity of showing how much confusion has arisen between confounding Regeneration with Conversion and the vague notions induced by the use of the word "Co-operation."

The *Formula Concordiæ* assumes the doctrine of predestination. It endeavoured to avoid the strict consequences of the Augustinian system by drawing a distinction between predestination and prescience. Præscientia enim Dei nihil aliud est, quam quod Deus omnia noverit antequam fiant. . . . . Hæc præscientia Dei simul ad bonos et malos pertinet, sed interim non est causa mali, neque est causa peccati; quæ hominem ad scelus impellat. . . . . Neque hæc Dei præscientia causa est, quod homines pereant; hoc enim

[1] It had its origin in this way. While the Saxon divines were convened at Torgau, in 1576, by the order of the Elector Augustus, a treatise was composed by James Andreä, Chancellor of Wirtemberg, with the object of healing the divisions of the Lutheran Church. It received the name of the Book of Torgau, and having been corrected by the greater proportion of the Lutheran doctors in German was presented to a select number of divines, who met at Bergen, a Benedictine monastery in the neighbourhood of Magdeburgh. From this book the Formula Concordiæ was entirely drawn.—Mosh. Cent., XVI., chap. 1. Andreä had been assisted in the compilation by Martin Chemnitz, Nicolas Selnecker, Andrew Musculus, Christopher Körner, and David Chytraeus. It was called the "Bergische Buch." It consists of two parts—1. The shorter one, *Epitome*; 2. The longer one, *Solida declaratio*. It was originally published in German and translated into Latin by L. Osiander.

sibi ipsis imputare debent. Sed præscientia Dei disponit malum, et metas illi constituit, quousque progredi et quamdiu durare debeat, idque eo dirigit, ut licet per se malum sit, nihilominus electis Dei ad salutem cedat. Prædestinatio vero seu æterna Dei electio tantum ad bonos et dilectos filios Dei pertinet, et hæc est causa ipsorum salutis. Etenim eorum salutem procurat et ea, quæ ad ipsam pertinent, disponit. Super hanc Dei prædestinationem salus nostra ita fundata est, ut inferorum portæ eam evertere nequeant. Hæc Dei prædestinatio non in arcano Dei consilio est scrutanda, sed in verbo Dei, in quo revelatur, quærenda est.

"The doctrine of the absolute decree of rejection in respect of some (*decretum reprobationis*) was," says Dr. Dorner, "after the overthrow of the Lutheran Predestinarians, dismissed from the Formula of Concord, both in the form that a part was eternally predestinated to damnation on account of unbelief originating from the free act of Adam, and in the Supralapsarian form, that the one part was ordained to eternal unbelief; it is rather said, as the merit of Christ is universal so also is the tendency of grace. It is through personal guilt that unbelievers are lost. The cause of unbelief and condemnation is not God, not a repulsive operation of the gospel, not a particular calling (*vocatio particularis*), not, finally, the want of *liberum arbitrium*, but the evil will of man and of the devil, and *this* evil will is not derived as necessary from original sin. The calling is general and sincere; there is nothing wanting in it, and if man does not resist it, it produces faith."

The *Formula* maintains the absolute election of some, but rejects the view that this election takes place in virtue of the Divine foresight of faith, although there is no election irrespective of faith and out of Christ. Faith is no cause of election. The opinion is rejected—*quod etiam in nobis ipsis aliqua causa sit electionis divinæ.* The subjectively mediative cause, the receiving, is not even taken into account.

Instead of the *Formula* restoring peace and concord in the Lutheran Churches, as was its object, it had the contrary effect, being instantly attacked both by Lutherans and Calvinists. It was accepted in Saxony by order of the Elector Augustus and by perhaps the greater part of the Lutheran Churches in process of time. It was rejected by the Churches of Hesse, Pomerania, the Palatinate of Zweibrücken (Deuxponts), Nuremberg, Holstein, Silesia, Denmark, Holland, Brunswick, and others, and attacked by the Swiss divines, with Hospinian at their head, by the Belgic divines, those of the Palatinate, together with those of the principalities of Anhalt and Bade.

The attacks made were based on various grounds by the different parties. The reason assigned by some was the loose and inaccurate mode in which the doctrine of the freedom of the human will was expressed, and by others that the terms employed

were too harsh and too clearly resembling the immoderate sense of Luther.

The Predestinarian doctrine of the *Formula Concordiæ* is no longer that of the Lutheran Predestinarians. Its effect at the time was to widen the breach between the Lutherans and Calvinists and to form an insurmountable obstacle to all schemes of reconciliation.

After the publication of the *Formula Concordiæ,* many German Churches embraced the doctrine of Calvin, particularly we may mention the Churches of Nassau, Hanau, and Isenberg, and in 1595 the Princes of Anhalt also renounced Lutheranism and embraced Calvinism; but prior to the Synod of Dort, in 1618, it does not appear that any of the Reformed Churches laid an obligation on their members by an article of faith of adhering to the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination.

Maurice, Landgrave of Hesse, forsook Lutheranism and embraced Calvinism, and in 1604 removed all the Lutheran professors from their places in the University of Marberg, and the doctors of that communion from the churches they had in his dominions. His example was followed by John Sigismund, Elector of Brandenberg, with the difference that he granted to his subjects an entire liberty in religious matters. But in embracing Calvinism he distinctly refused to admit Calvin's doctrine of divine grace and absolute decrees, and on that account sent no deputies to the Synod of Dort nor adopted its decisions. The Confessio Sigismundi, 1613, distinctly denies an absolute decree of individual reprobation.

Several attempts were made to bring about a union between the Lutheran and Calvinist Churches, but without effect. King James I. tried it, in 1615, through the instrumentality of Peter du Moulin, the most eminent of the Protestant divines in France, and in 1631, in the Synod of Charenton, the Calvinists held out the olive branch to the Lutherans, but ineffectually. Uladislaus IV., King of Poland, formed the more ambitious design of effecting a reconciliation between the Calvinists, Lutherans, and Romans, and ordered a conference at Thorn, in 1645, but the differences between the parties seemed to have been but widened as the result. A conference held at Cassel, in 1661, by order of William VI., Landgrave of Hesse, between Musæus and Henichius, professors at Rinteten, on the side of the Lutherans, and Curtius and Heinius, of the University of Marberg, on that of the Calvinists, stood a better chance of proving effectual, good feeling being displayed on both sides, but no terms could be agreed upon. The Lutherans always held back.

The subject of predestination seems to have been one on which men never could agree for any length of time, and divisions soon found their head among the Calvinists themselves. Even in Calvin's lifetime, and in his own Geneva, his doctrine did not pass

without challenge. Sebastian Castellio,[1] master of the public school at Geneva, and Jerome Bolsec, a French monk of the Carmelite order, also settled there, protested against it without effect. The former was removed from his office and banished the city, in 1544, retiring to Basle, where he was well received and given the professorship of Greek in the University there, He subsequently published an exposition of the 9th chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, violently attacking Calvin's doctrine. The latter had the courage, in 1551, after the conclusion of Divine worship, to declaim, in the strongest terms, against the doctrine of absolute decrees, for which he was cast into prison and soon afterwards sent into banishment. The Genevese, in their embarrassment as to how to deal with Bolsec, sought the advice of the Swiss Churches. The Church of Zurich counselled severity towards him, while Berne and Basle counselled indulgence. The Council of Geneva leaned to the former, and on the 18th December, 1551, pronounced the sentence. Bolsec subsequently returned to communion with Rome, and published the most slanderous libels respecting Calvin, Beza, and others of the reformers.

Cameron, about 1618, in the Academy of Saumur, openly opposed absolute predestination as taught by Calvin, and he was followed by his pupils, Moses Amyraut and Paul Testard. Cameron may be regarded as the founder of that theological system which in England usually passes under the name of "Baxterianism." Baxter says, in the preface to his *Saints' Rest*, "The middle way which Cameron, L. Crocius, Martinius, Amyrauldus, Davenant, with all the divines of Britain and Bremen in the Synod of Dort, go, I think, is nearest the truth of any that I know who have written on those points of Redemption and Universal Grace." Amyraut was Professor of Theology in the Academy of Saumur, and wrote with great ability on the subjects of predestination, election, and grace. He adopted what is known as *Universalismus hypotheticus*, and in this was followed by many of the most eminent French theologians.[2] He attempted to reconcile the doctrine of predestination as taught by Calvin with the doctrine of universal redemption in a way peculiarly his own. His proposed reconciliation has been summed up in the following propositions:

That God desires the happiness of all men, and that no mortal

[1] In 1578 Socinus published Castellio's Dialogues on Predestination, Election, Free-will, &c., under the fictitious name of "Felix Turpio Urbevetanus" Spanhemii Elenchus. Ed. 1701, p. 238.

[2] Amyraut, in his Traité de la prédestination—Si vous considerés le soin que Dieu a eu de procurer le salut au genre humain par l'envoy de son fils au monde, et les choses qu'il y a faites et souffertes à ceste fin, la grace est *universelle* et présentée à tous les hommes. Mais si vous regardés à la *condition* qu'il y a necessairement apposée, de croire en son fils, vous trouverés qu'encore que ce soin de donner aux hommes un Rédempteur procède d'une merveilleuse charité envers le genre humain, néantmoins ceste charité ne passe par ceste mesure, de donner le salut aux hommes, pourveu qu'ils ne le refusent pas: s'ils le refusent, il leur en oste l'espérance, et eux par leur incrédulité aggravent leur condamnation.

is excluded *by any eternal decree* from the benefits that are procured by the death, suffering, and gospel of Christ:

That, however, none can be made a partaker of the blessings of the gospel and of eternal salvation unless he believes in Jesus Christ:

That such, indeed, is the immense and universal goodness of the Great Supreme King that He refuses to none the power of believing, though He does not grant unto all His assistance and succour that they may wisely improve this power to the attainment of everlasting salvation:

And that, in consequence of this, multitudes perish through their own fault, and not from any want of goodness in God.

Amyraut's doctrine does not differ much from that of Arminius, though he himself wrote against Arminianism. He certainly agreed with Arminius on the doctrine of general redemption and the universal offer of grace, but he neutralised these points by Calvinistic modifications. The main distinction is that while the latter makes all participate in that pardoning grace, upon which all depend, by bestowing upon them the means of believing, Amyrauldianism asserts a general operation of grace, creating merely the possibility of believing. Amyraut endeavoured to sail nearer to Augustine than even Calvin, by resting the cause of perdition of any not on the absence of the loving purpose of God to all, but on the fact of the voluntary fall into sin of the individual. Amyraut was attacked in the National Synod of Alençon, in 1637, by Du Moulin and others, but he explained his doctrine and defended himself with so much ability that he was honourably acquitted, and silence was imposed on both sides with regard to the further discussion of these questions. In Holland his doctrine was stoutly opposed by Rivet, Spanheim, Des Marets, and others, while he found supporters later in Daillé, Blondel, Fancher, Mestrezat, Dubosc, Claude, and others. His doctrine gradually found favour and acceptance in France and was ultimately received in all the universities of the Huguenots in that country, and thus became disseminated through all the Reformed Churches of Europe.[1]

[1] On the modified scheme, supported by Cameron and Amyraut, Dr. Maclaine, himself a Presbyterian Calvinist, makes the following moderate and judicious observations: "This mitigated view of the doctrine of Predestination has *only one* defect, but it is *a capital one*. It represents God as *desiring* a thing (that is, salvation and happiness) for ALL, which, in order to its attainment, requires a degree of his assistance and succour, which he refuseth to many. This rendered grace and redemption UNIVERSAL only in *words* but PARTIAL in *reality*; and therefore did not at all mend the matter. The Supralapsarians were consistent with themselves; but their doctrine was harsh and terrible, and was founded on the most unworthy notions of the Supreme Being. And, on the other hand, the system of Amyraut was full of inconsistencies. Nay, even the Sublapsarian doctrine has its difficulties, and rather palliates than removes the horrors of Supralapsarianism. What, then, is to be done? From what quarter shall the candid and well-disposed Christian receive that solid satisfaction and wise direction which neither of these systems is adapted to administer? These he will receive by turning his dazzled and feeble eye from the secret decrees of God, which were neither designed to be rules of actions nor sources of comfort to mortals here below; and by fixing his view upon the mercy of God, as it is manifested through Christ, the pure laws and sublime promises of his gospel, and the respectable equity of his present government and his future tribunal."

Samuel Huber, a native of Bern, also fell out with Calvin and Beza. He taught in opposition a universalism of election and justification, basing it on the free grace of God and the all-sufficient sacrifice of Christ. He considered that election does not take place on account of faith, though faith comes to the enjoyment of election and unbelief is damnable. Faith, however, he thought, was only possible if man had previously perceived that he was already elect. If he rejects grace in unbelief he excludes himself from salvation. Huber joined the Lutheran Church and became first a pastor in the neighbourhood of Tubingen and afterwards a professor in the University of Würtemberg. His universalism of election gave offence to the Lutherans, whom he accused of a propensity to the doctrine of Calvin. He was opposed by Polycarp Lyser and Aegidius Hunnius. The latter restricts the unconditional character of the divine covenant of grace, and treats the *prævisa fides* as contributive to election. He considers that those who are willing to hear stand nearer to salvation than those who place obstructions in the way of it by unwillingness to hear, and that this explains the difference in their fate.

Coccejan, professor at Bremen in 1629, and at Leyden at the time of his death in 1669, introduced a new school of thought, which flourished during several decades. The doctrine of the unchangeableness of God and His decrees as held by the Reformers had left no room for a classification of history into successive periods governed by different principles. It had left no place for a development from a lower condition to a higher, and failed to give sufficient force to the progressive character of God's revelation of Himself and His purposes of mercy and grace. Coccejan brought prominently forward the principle which had been veiled in the writings of such men as Hyperius, Olevianus, and Eglin, namely, that of the *Covenant* on which he bases the acts of God, showing that they are susceptible of various aspects during successive ages. He rejected the idea of the Divine counsel alone being the central seat of salvation, taking such a view of the relation of God to man as is determined and conditioned by Him with reference to the variety of their several needs.[1]

Fran. Burmann developed the system of Coccejan. The Coccejan system at first only denied the absoluteness and unchangeableness of the divine decrees without attempting to touch the fact of particular election, but as the original covenant with the human race was represented as bearing a character of universalism there was in reality no place for a double original decree of election and reprobation. However desirous the upholders of the system might have been to stand by the Calvinistic scheme there can be no doubt they attacked its very basis; for if a variety in the forms of the divine covenant at different periods were regarded

[1] Dr. Dorner, *Hist. of Prot. Theol.*, vol. 2, p. 36.

as not inconsistent with the immutability of the divine counsel, *a fortiori*, the allowing His self-limitation out of regard to human freedom could not be regarded as working an inconsistency.

The natural result of this theological teaching was displayed by Peter Poiret in his "Dispensation of the Covenants," in which he embraced the universality of Coccejan, applying it even after the fall and attributing to the divine covenants the meaning that divine grace has always sought by various means to gain and to save mankind.

The Lutheran Church, during the 17th century, more and more decidedly renounced Predestinarianism in its harsher forms. The *Formula Concordiæ* was gradually departed from, and it became the prevailing doctrine that though persevering faith is not the cause of election, yet, as foreseen by God, it is made the condition of election. It is true that some, like Calovius, would not admit faith to be a *causa impulsiva movens* of election, but others, like Gerhard, König, Quenstedt, and Musæus, held that it was, while denying it to be the meritorious cause.[1]

Thus, by degrees, the absoluteness of the decree of predestination was modified, and in its place was substituted the principle that God had resolved to save those who finally persevered in faith; but the principle was strictly adhered to that the prevenient grace of God was wholly independent of human merit. During the middle ages and in the early part of the 17th century, theology had been almost exclusively viewed or attempted to be viewed from the Divine side, while the creature, the human side of Christology, with the doctrine of the operation of grace, had been to all intents and purposes merged and lost sight of in the Divine. Later, philosophy was brought to bear on the human side. As an able modern writer[2] has said, "The claims of subjectivity were pressed to such an extreme as to apparently be made the absolute principle, but this extreme ultimately brought about a reaction towards objectivity in the early part of the present century."

We must now glance at home for a little space before tracing the rise and progress of Arminianism in the Low Countries and on the continent generally.

In 1592, William Perkins, an eminent divine in the University of Cambridge, published a book called *Armilla Aurea*, and a little later a "Treatise of Predestination and of the largeness of God's Grace, containing the order of the causes of salvation and damnation according to God's Word." This was in fact a reduction of Calvin's doctrine into a more distinct and methodical form but on the

[1] Thus Musæus says, "Since all that is in God (His decrees as well as His attributes) partake of His own independent and unchangeable nature, nothing can properly be to Him a *causa impulsiva decreti*, otherwise His decisions would be determined and His acts induced by something created." The old argument of the Calvinists against the Arminians.

[2] Dr. Dorner, *Hist. of Prot. Theol.*

Supralapsarian hypothesis. In his preface to this latter work he asserts that in his day there were four several opinions respecting God's predestination. "The first," says he, "was of the old and new Pelagians, who placed the cause of God's predestination in man, in that they hold that God did ordain men to life or death according as He did foresee that they would, by their natural free-will, either reject or receive grace offered. The second of them, who by some are termed Lutherans, who taught that God, foreseeing that all mankind being shut up under unbelief would therefore reject grace offered, did thereupon purpose to choose some to salvation in His pure mercy without any regard to their faith or good works, and the rest to reject, being moved to do this because He did eternally foresee that they would reject His grace offered them in the Gospel. The third, of Semi-Pelagian Papists, who ascribe God's predestination partly to mercy and partly to men's foreseen preparation and meritorious works. The fourth, of such as teach that the cause of the execution of God's predestination is His mercy in Christ in them which are saved, and in them which perish the fall and corruption of man; yet so as that the decree and eternal counsel of God concerning them both has not any cause other than His will and pleasure."

Perkins's work is no doubt an able treatise from the extreme Calvinist's point of view, and it was much sought after both in this country and abroad. The work was not however suffered to pass unchallenged, and abroad it was exhaustively replied to by Arminius in his book entitled "Examen Prædestinationis Perkinsanæ," which unfortunately never met the eye of Perkins, as he died the very year of its completion. In this country Perkins's book was strongly censured by Dr. Abbot, then Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford and afterwards Bishop of Salisbury, who, in his book against Tompson, thus speaks of Perkins and his treatise: "Perkins, though otherwise a godly and learned man, in his description of Divine Predestination, which, contrary not only to the Doctrine of the Primitive times but also unto that of the Church of England, he builds upon an absolute decree of Almighty God, without reference to the fall of Adam, ran himself into no small error. The defence being undertaken by some learned men has given the Church unnecessary troubles, which continue, not without manifest scandal and danger to it, whilst everyone rather chooses to follow his own way than suffer himself to be guided in the labyrinth by the line of truth (as by the clue of Ariadne) drawn from the undeniable truth of Holy Scripture."

The doctrine of predestination, as stated in Perkins's treatise, was also attacked by Dr. Baro, sometime Lady Margaret Professor

of Divinity at Cambridge,[1] and by Barrett, Fellow of Caius College, in the same University, and this called on the stage Dr. Whittaker, the Regius Professor of Divinity, who had been in early days intimately associated with the Reformers abroad and had strongly adopted the views of Calvin and Beza in their most objectionable form. Dr. Baro's views were as nearly as possible those promulgated by Melancthon.

In consequence of the disputes between the two professors the University became divided into two parties. Seeing this, Dr. Whittaker proceeded to London to Dr. Whitgift, then Archbishop of Canterbury, and asserting that Baro's views were Pelagian he desired the archbishop to approve of certain articles which he had previously framed that the same might be put forth with authority for settling the disputes in the University. The articles were approved by the archbishop and by a few bishops and others, amongst them being Dr. Fletcher, Bishop of London, Dr. Vaughan, Bishop of Bangor, and Dr. Tyndal, Dean of Ely, who assembled at Lambeth, in November, 1595. Some of those who most strongly opposed the articles were absent when they were assented to, and it is thought that the archbishop himself did not entirely approve of them, but being an easy going man, or, as Milner, the Church historian, describes him, an "utter enemy to all constraint in matters of conscience and willing to indulge his dissenting brethren, as many of the other bishops thought, to a fault," and desirous no doubt of appeasing the discord at the University, assented to them. They were somewhat altered from the form in which they had been proposed, but, as approved of, they were as follows:—

1. God from eternity has predestinated certain persons unto life and has reprobated certain persons unto death.

2. The moving or efficient cause of predestination unto life is not the foresight of faith, or of perseverance, or of good works, or of anything that is in the persons predestinated, but solely the goodwill and pleasure of God.

3. The Predestinate are a predetermined and certain number, which can neither be augmented nor diminished.

4. Those who are not predestinated to salvation shall necessarily be condemned for their sins.

5. A true living and justifying faith, and the Spirit of God jus-

[1] The four propositions for which Dr. Baro was prosecuted in the Vice-Chancellor's Court were—

"Docuit, Deum omnes et singulos, absoluta Voluntate, ad Vitam æternam creasse.

"Voluntatem Dei duplicem esse, *viz.*, antecedentem, et consequentem. Antecedente quidem Voluntate, Deum neminem rejecisse.

"Christum mortuum esse pro omnibus et singulis.

"Promissiones Dei ad Vitam universales esse: et æque spectare ad Cainem et Abelem, Esavam atque Jacobum, Judam atque Petrum: et Cainem non magis a Deo fuisse rejectum, quam Abelem, antequam se excluserat."—Strype's *Life of Whitgift*, p. 470.

tifying is not extinguished, does not utterly fail, does not vanish away in the elect,[1] either finally or totally.

6. A man truly faithful, that is, such a one as is endued with justifying faith, is sure, from the full assurance of faith[2] of receiving the remission of his sins and of his everlasting salvation through Christ.

7. Saving grace is not given, is not communicated, is not granted to all men by which they may be saved if they will.

8. No man can come unto Christ unless it be given unto him, and unless the Father shall draw him, and all men are not drawn by the Father, that they may come to the Son.

9. It is not in the will or power of every man to be saved.[3]

These articles were sent to Cambridge, and Dr. Whittaker boasted that he had obtained the victory. It is related that, meeting the Chancellor of Cambridge, Lord Treasurer Burleigh, he acquainted him with what had been done, and showed him the articles. That great man, at once perceiving how dangerous it was to thus hastily determine in points of so much doubt and difficulty, strongly disapproved of the whole proceedings, saying that "he would make the authors of this business repent of it." He was as good as his word, for he immediately repaired to the Queen and pointed out to her how, by the laws of the land, no man or body of men have the power to decree or determine on points of doctrine without the authority of Parliament and the consent of the Sovereign. He went on to explain to her what had occurred, and how a few divines had met together and decided concerning questions respecting which men of the greatest learning could never agree, adding that it was evident that those who passed the articles in question were of opinion and taught that whatever was done in human affairs, whether good or evil, was necessitated by the force of an immutable decree, and that this necessity was laid upon the very wills of men also. "Which things," said he, "if true, most sovereign Lady, in vain do I and

[1] In the original draft, instead of "in the elect," were the words "in those who have once been partakers of it"—*in iis qui semel ejus participes fuerunt.*

[2] In the original draft, instead of "full assurance of faith," were the words "certainty of faith"—*certitudine.*

[3] 1. Deus, ab æterno, prædestinavit quosdam ad vitam, quosdam reprobavit ad mortem.

2. Causa movens aut efficiens prædestinationis ad vitam, non est prævisio fidei aut perseverantiæ, aut bonorum operum aut ullius rei quæ insit in personis prædestinatis, sed sola voluntas beneplaciti Dei.

3. Prædestinatorum præfinitus et certus est numerus, qui nec augeri nec minui potest.

4. Qui non sunt prædestinati ad salutem, necessario propter peccata sua damnabuntur.

5. Vera, viva, et justificans fides, et Spiritus Dei justificantis, non extinguitur, non excidit, non evanescit, in electis aut finaliter aut totaliter.

6. Homo vere fidelis, id est, fide justificante præditus, certus est plerophoria fidei, de remissione peccatorum suorum, et salute sempiterna sua per Christum.

7. Gratia salutaris non tribuitur, non communicatur, non conceditur universis hominibus, qua servari possint, si velint.

8. Nemo potest venire ad Christum, nisi datum ei fuerit, et nisi Pater eum traxerit; et omnes homines non trahuntur a Patre, ut veniant ad Filium.

9. Non est positum in arbitrio aut potestate uniuscujusque hominis servari.

others, your majesty's faithful servants, hold long councils about what is needful to be done in any affairs and what may be of use to yourself and your kingdom, seeing that all consultation about things that necessarily come to pass is downright folly."

The Queen was very indignant with what had been done by Whitgift, and ordered him to be sent for. The archbishop appeared and pleaded to her Majesty that it was not the intention of himself or his colleagues to determine anything without public authority or to make canons by themselves alone, but they had given counsel of peace to the Professors lest their private disputes should break out into public mischief. The Councillors who were present at the interview between the Queen and the archbishop pressed the latter hard, declaring that the convention itself was a crime, it having taken place without the consent of the Queen, and that it was far more probable that peace might have been better preserved had the bishops kept their judgment entirely to themselves. "Why," asked they, "were the assertions of the bishops sent to Cambridge but that they might have some appearance of a *canon*? Was it so much trouble to wait upon the Queen once about an affair that was debated for so many days?" The archbishop asked pardon for his rash proceeding, and promised that he would write to Cambridge that the Lambeth Articles might be suppressed.

Dr. Whittaker died soon after this, and when his life was written by a friend of his, who desired to insert therein these Lambeth Articles, they were by authority suppressed. Whittaker was succeeded in his professorship by Dr. Overall, afterwards Bishop of Norwich, who certainly held views not in accordance with those of his predecessor.

Eight years after the suppression of the Lambeth Articles, an attempt was made to have them declared to be orthodox and to get them inserted among the Articles of the Church of England. This was in the first year of King James I., at a conference held at Hampton Court on the 12th January, 1603. There were present Whitgift, Archbishop of Canterbury; Bancroft, Bishop of London; Matthews, Bishop of Durham; Bilson, Bishop of Winchester; Babbington, Bishop of Worcester; Rudd, Bishop of St. David's; Watson, Bishop of Chichester; Robinson, Bishop of Carlisle; Dove, Bishop of Peterborough; and others. Dr. Reynolds (supported by Dr. Spark, Mr. Knewstubs, and Mr. Chatterton), proposed that the nine Lambeth Articles, which he termed "the nine assertions orthodoxal," should be declared by that assembly to be orthodox and be added to the Articles of the Church. He desired also that the Articles should be explained in some particulars and specially that the 16th Article, where it is said that after we have received the Holy Ghost we may depart from grace, might receive the addition "but neither totally nor finally." This

was earnestly opposed by the Bishop of London, who had been present when the Lambeth Articles were approved, but who seems subsequently to have altered his mind, and by Dr. John Overall, who was then Dean of St. Paul's. The Bishop of London observed to the King that "very many in these days neglected holiness of life, presuming too much upon persisting in grace; laying all their religion upon predestination, saying 'If I shall be saved, I shall be saved,'" which he termed a desperate doctrine, showing it to be contrary to sound theology and the true doctrine of predestination wherein we should rather reason *ascendendo* than *descendendo*, thus, "I live in obedience to God, in love with my neighbour, I follow my occasion, &c., therefore I trust God has elected me and predestinated me to salvation; not thus, which is the usual course of argument: God has predestined and chosen me to life; therefore, though I sin ever so grievously, yet I shall not be damned, for when He once loveth, He loveth to the end."

The King decided not to admit these Articles, not so much, perhaps, on the ground of his disapprobation of any of them but because he was unwilling, as he expressed himself, "to stuff the book (*i.e.* the 39 Articles) with conclusions theological."[1]

The Lambeth Articles, though rejected as additions to the Articles of the Church of England, found their way into the Articles of the Church of Ireland and were sanctioned on behalf of the king by Lord Deputy Chichester. The latter were drawn up by Dr. Usher, afterwards Primate of Ireland, then a professed Calvinist, though in later years alleged to be an Arminian, who not only put in the Lambeth Articles but indulged in some startling assertions of his own; as, for instance, that the Pope was Antichrist or the man of sin, that the power of sacerdotal absolution was no more than declaratory, and so forth.

Thus matters stood at the time of the celebrated Synod of Dordrecht or Dort.

In the year 1602, James Van Harmen, or Arminius, as he is usually termed, who, being a pupil of Beza, had been educated at Geneva in the Calvinist views, but had deserted them because he found that universal redemption was the teaching of Scripture and deemed this inconsistent with Calvin's and Beza's[2] doctrine of unconditional decrees, was chosen Professor of Divinity in the University of Leyden in succession to Dr. Junius. It must be

[1] It is very well known that the translation of the Bible—the authorized version made by order of the King—was mostly done by men who held extreme views on the side of predestination.

[2] It has been alleged by some that the view of Arminius and his followers is Popish, but the points debated between the Remonstrants and the Contra-Remonstrants in the Belgic Churches and between the rigid and moderate Lutherans in Germany have been as we have already seen as fiercely fought out between the Franciscans and the Dominicans in the Church of Rome, the Remonstrants and the moderate Lutherans in the main agreeing with the Franciscans and Jesuits, as the Contra-Remonstrants and he rigid Lutherans do with the Dominicans and the Augustines.

remembered that the Reformation had been introduced into the Netherlands partly by Lutherans from Germany and partly by Calvinists from France, but that the Belgic Confession, which favoured the Calvinistic doctrines, had, along with the Palatine or Heidelberg Catechism, been from about the year 1570 invested with public authority in the Churches of the Netherlands.

Arminius's teaching soon brought him into collision with the upholders of the doctrine of the Geneva Reformer, by whose followers he was accused of heterodoxy. Parties were formed in the University of Leyden, and great animosity was evinced on both sides amongst the students. The disputes might have been arranged amicably had they not been taken up beyond the limits of the University. At the annual meeting of the Synods, in 1605, the class at Dort took up the cudgels and sent the following grievance to the University: "Inasmuch as rumours are heard that certain controversies have arisen in the Church and University at Leyden concerning the doctrine of the Reformed Churches, this class has judged it necessary that the synod should deliberate respecting the safest and most speedy method of settling those controversies; that all the schisms and causes of offence which spring out of them may seasonably be removed and the union of the Reformed Churches preserved inviolate against the calumnies of adversaries."

This document gave grave offence to the professors at Leyden, and they sent a reply to the effect that they wished the Dort Class had acted with greater discretion and in a more orderly manner; that in their own opinion there were mere disputes among the students than was agreeable to the professors; but that among themselves, the Professors of Theology, no differences existed that could be considered as affecting in the least the fundamentals of doctrine. This was signed by Arminius, then Rector of the University, by Gomarus, his most bitter opponent, and others.

The torch, however, had been put to the fagots and a flame was kindled throughout the United Provinces, with the result that, from that date, the breach between the two parties gradually widened, and in 1608, Gomarus, who but three years before had certified that between himself and Arminius there was "no dissention in fundamentals," distinctly declared that the difference detected in their opinions was of so great moment that he with the opinion of Arminius, should "not dare to appear before the judgment of God"; and unless a remedy were maturely applied it was to be feared lest in a short time one province would be engaged in contest against another, church against church, state against state, and citizens against each other. This unfortunately proved a true prophecy.

In the heat of the disputes, on the 19th of October, 1609, Arminius died. His contention during his latter days had been that

in the Reformed Churches a doctrine was delivered concerning divine predestination, which was at variance with the nature of God, with His wisdom, justice, and goodness; with the nature of man and his freewill, with the work of the creation, with the nature of life and death eternal, and finally with that of sin; which took away divine grace, was inimical to the glory of God and pernicious to the salvation of men; which made God the author of sin, hindered sorrow for sin, took away all pious solicitude, lessened the earnest desire of doing good works, extinguished the ardour of prayer, took away the "fear and trembling" with which we ought to "work out our own salvation," made way for desperation, subverted the gospel, hindered the ministry of the word, and, lastly, overturned the foundations not only of the Christian religion but also of all religion.[1]

The death of Arminius removed the only man who was able to restrain his followers and to preserve peace between the contending parties. The breach grew wider and wider, and each party sought the sanction of the State for their own views. In the year 1610 the followers of Arminius addressed their *Remonstrance*, containing the substance of their doctrine, to the States of Holland and West Friesland, asking for a revision or correction of the symbolic books of the Church—the Belgian Confession and the Heidelberg Catechism—and demanding toleration for the profession of their views. This fact procured for them the name of *Remonstrants*, and their opponents having presented a counter-remonstrance were thenceforth dubbed *Contra-Remonstrants*.

Three of the principal followers of Arminius were the famous Episcopius, Grotius, and Barneveldt, and their leading tenets as given and translated by Heylin were as follows:—

1. Almighty God, by an eternal and unchangeable decree, ordained in Jesus Christ His only Son, before the foundations of the world were laid, to save all those in Christ, for Christ, and through Christ, who being fallen and under the command of sin, by the assistance of the grace of the Holy Ghost, do persevere in faith and obedience to the very end.

2. To which end Jesus Christ suffered death for all men, and for every man that by His death upon the cross, He might obtain for all mankind both the forgiveness of their sins and reconciliation with the Lord their God, with this condition notwithstanding, that none but true believers should enjoy the benefit of the reconciliation and forgiveness of sins.—John ii., 16; I. John ii., 2.

[1] See the Historical Preface to the Articles of the Synod of Dort, edited by the Rev. Thomas Scott. It must be here mentioned that this preface, of which Mr. Scott makes so much use, and which he magnifies to a height and authority which it certainly had not at the time it was issued, or indeed at any time prior to 1818, when Mr. Scott made his great discovery, is nothing less than a violent political manifesto drawn up by Calvinist divines such as Polyander, Walæus, Thysius, Heinsius, Hommius, Colonius, and Lacts, and principally compiled by Hommius.

3. Man has not saving faith in and of himself, nor can he attain it by the power of his own freewill; since living in a state of sin and defection from God, he is not able of himself to think well or do anything that is really or truly good, amongst which things saving faith is to be accounted. And therefore it is necessary that by God in Christ, and through the working of the Holy Ghost, he be regenerated and renewed in his understanding, will, affections, and all his other faculties, that so he may be able to understand, think, will, and bring to pass anything that is good, according to the saying in St. John xv., 5, "without Me ye can do nothing."

4. The grace of God is the beginning, promotion, and accomplishment of everything that is good in us, inasmuch as the regenerate man can neither think well nor do anything that is good, nor resist any sinful temptations without this grace preventing, co-operating, and assisting; and consequently all good works, which any man in his life can attain to, are to be attributed and ascribed to the grace of God. But as for the manner of the co-operation of this grace it is not to be thought to be irresistible, as it is said of many in the Holy Scriptures that they did resist the Holy Ghost, as in Acts vii. and in other places.

5. They who are grafted into Christ by a lively faith and are thoroughly made partakers of His quickening Spirit, have a sufficiency of strength by which (the Holy Ghost contributing His assistance to them) they may not only fight but obtain the victory against the devil, sin, the world, and all infirmities of the flesh. Most true it is that Jesus Christ is present with them by His Spirit in all their temptations, that He reaches out His hand unto them and shows Himself ready to support them, if, on their part, they prepare themselves for the encounter, and beseech His help, and are not deficient in their duties; so that they cannot be seduced by the cunning, or taken out of the hands of Christ by the power of Satan, according, as it is said in St. John, "No man taketh them out of My hand, &c." cap. x. But it is first to be well weighed and proved by the Holy Scripture, whether by their own negligence they may not forsake those principles of saving grace by which they are sustained in Christ, embrace the present world again, apostatize from the saving doctrine once delivered to them, suffer a shipwreck of their conscience and fall away from the grace of God, before we can publicly teach these doctrines with any sufficient tranquillity or assurance of mind.[1]

[1] 1. Deus æterno et immutabili Decreto in Jesu Christo filio suo, ante jactum mundi fundamentum statuit, ex lapso et peccatis obnoxio humano genere, illos in Christo, propter Christum, et per Christum servare, qui spiritus sancti gratia in eundem filium ejus credunt, et in ea fide, fideique obedientia, per eandem gratiam, usque ad finem perseverant.

2. Proinde Deus Christus pro omnibus ac singulis mortuus est; atque id ita quidem, ut omnibus per mortem crucis reconciliationem, et peccatorum remissionem impetrarit: ea tamen conditione, ut nemo illa peccatorum remissione fruatur, præter hominem fidelem.—*John* ii., 16; I *John* ii., 2.

3. Homo fidem salutarem a seipso non habet, nec vi liberi sui arbitrii, quando quidem

The parties were admitted to a public conference at Hague, in the year 1611—usually spoken of as the Collatio Hagiensis,—where the Remonstrants were represented by John Utenbogardus, Adrian Barrius, John Arnoldi Corvin, Nicolas Grevinchovius, Edward Poppius, and Simon Episcopius, the Contra-Remonstrants being represented by Peter Plaucinus, Libertus Frascinus, Ruardus Acronius, John Beccius, John Bogardus, and Festus Hommius. No good resulted from the conference and no determination in favour of either party was come to. Each party now openly sought the patronage of men of power and influence.

The Arminians put themselves under the protection of John Van Olden Barneveldt, a man of great influence in the Council of State for the United Belgic Provinces, and by his influence they obtained an edict from the States of Holland and West Friesland, 1613, requiring and enjoining a mutual toleration of opinions on both sides. They soon, however, came in contact with Maurice Prince of Orange, Commander-General of all the forces of the United Provinces, who had espoused the cause of the Contra-Remonstrants, and who, at their continued solicitation, suddenly marched his army from town to town, altering the guards, changing the officers, and displacing the magistrates where he found any disaffected towards him. He managed to get Barneveldt, Grotius, Hooggerbeets, and others into his hands, and put the first to death,[1] while he imprisoned the others.

The Calvinists, taking advantage of the downfall of the leaders of their adversaries, demanded a national synod to judge of the points in dispute. To this the States General eventually assented, and issued their edict for its assembly on the 1st May, 1618, at Dort, a town well known for its hostility to the Arminians. It

in statu defectionis, et peccati, nihil boni, quod quidem vere est bonum (quale est fides salutaris) ex se potest cogitare, velle aut facere: sed necessarium est, eum a Deo, in Christo, per spiritum ejus sanctum, regigni, renovari, mente, affectibus, seu voluntate, et omnibus facultatibus, ut aliquid boni posset intelligere, cogitare, velle, et perficere, secundum illud.—*John* xv., 5. Sine me potestis nihil.

4. Dei gratia est initium progressus, et perfectio omnis boni atque adeo quidem, ut ipse homo regenitus, absque hac præcedanea seu adventitia, excitante, consequente, et co-operante gratia, neque boni quid cogitare, velle, aut facere potest, neque etiam ulli malæ tentationi resistere, adeo quidem ut omnia bona opera, quæ excogitare possumus, Dei gratiæ in Christo tribuenda sint. Quoad vero modum co-operationis illius gratiæ, illa non est irresistibilis: de multis enim dicitur, eos spiritui sancto resistisse. Actorum vii. et alibi multis locis.

5. Qui Jesu Christo per veram fidem sunt insiti, ac proinde spiritus ejus vivificantis participes, ii abunde habent facultatum, quibus contra Satanam, peccatum, mundum et propriam suam carnem pugnent et victoriam obtineant; verum tamen per gratiæ spiritus sancti subsidium. Jesus Christus quidem illis spiritu suo in omnibus tentationibus adest, manum porrigit, et modo sint ad certamen prompti, et ejus auxilium petant, neque officio suo desint, eos confirmat; adeo quidem ut nulla Satanæ fraude, aut vi seduci, vel e manibus Christi eripi, possint, secundum illud Johannis x. Nemo illos e manu mea eripiet. Sed an illi ipsi negligentia sua, principium illud quo sustentantur in Christo, deserere non possint, et præsentem mundum iterum amplecti, a sancta doctrina ipsis semel tradita deficere, conscientiæ naufragium facere, a gratia excidere; penitus ex sacra scriptura esset expendendum, antequam illud cum plena animi tranquillitate, et plerophoria dicere possumus.

[1] He was decapitated at the Hague, 14th May, 1619.

was subsequently postponed to the 1st November in the same year, and actually began to sit on the 13th of that month. Deputies from all the provinces of Holland were joined by their brethren sent from the other Reformed Churches of England, Switzerland, Hesse, Bremen, and the Palatine to decide the matters in controversy.

James the First was induced to send deputies partly from political motives and partly from his love of theological controversy and his friendship for the Prince of Orange. It must be remembered that James was educated in Scotland, where the doctrine of Calvin was received as gospel, and that at the very time of the assembly of the Synod of Dort he was much governed by Dr. Montague, Bishop of Bath and Wells and Dean of His Majesty's Chapel Royal, a man who had entered into the predestination controversies when at Cambridge, and was a thorough Calvinist.

The King selected four of the most eminent theologians in the realm, viz., Dr. George Carleton, Bishop of Llandaff, afterwards Bishop of Chichester; Dr. Joseph Hall, then Dean of Worcester, afterwards Bishop of Exeter and lastly of Norwich; Dr. John Davenant, President of Queen's College, Cambridge, and Margaret Professor, afterwards Bishop of Salisbury, whose "profound learning, acuteness of intellect, catholic spirit, active benevolence, and meekness," were admitted by those most hostile to him in theological views; and Dr. Samuel Ward, Procter of Sidney College and Archdeacon of Taunton. Walter Balcanqual, a Presbyter of the Church of Scotland, afterwards Dean of Rochester, was subsequently sent to succeed Hales as agent to the ambassador, and thus, in a way, the Church of Scotland was represented. When Hall, on account of ill health, returned home, his place was filled by Dr. Goad, Precentor of St. Paul's and Chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury, who is described as a person everyway eminent in his time, having the reputation of a great and general scholar, exact critic, and historian, a poet, orator, schoolman, and divine.[1]

Soon after the assembling at Dort, Dr. Carleton addressed the States General in an eloquent speech, urging upon them the preservation of truth and the cultivation of peace. The English deputies had been strictly enjoined not to allow any modification of the universality of Christ's redemption. To this they religiously adhered, and nothing but the threatened loss of the English divines at the synod induced an insertion of this doctrine in the Canons. At one time there was some hesitation, and it is stated that Dr. Davenant declared he would sooner cut off his hand than permit any modification of the doctrine. The two articles on this point

[1] He probably was a Calvinist when sent to the Synod or he would not have been deputed by the King as a representative; but it is clear that either at the Synod or subsequently he changed his views, for he is the author of a disputation concerning the necessity and contingency of events in the world in respect of God's eternal decrees, which is certainly not Calvinistic. Dr. Goad was afterwards Prebendary of Winchester and Canterbury.

and on which the English deputies insisted, run thus (chap. ii. art. 5-6): "The promise of the Gospel is, that whosoever believes in Christ crucified shall not perish, but have everlasting life. Which promise ought to be announced and proposed, promiscuously and indiscriminately, to all nations and men, to whom God, in His good pleasure, has sent the Gospel, with the command to repent and believe. But because many who are called by the Gospel do not repent nor believe in Christ, but perish in unbelief, this does not arise from defect or insufficiency of the sacrifice offered by Christ upon the cross but from their own fault."

The synod had barely commenced its deliberations when a dispute drove the Arminian party from the assembly. The Arminians insisted upon beginning with a refutation of the Calvinist doctrine, especially that of reprobation, which they knew to be their strongest point. The Calvinists, on the other hand, being conscious that this was the weakest part of their case, and that their strength lay in maintaining a gratuitous election and slurring over as much as possible their doctrine of reprobation, insisted that the doctrine of election should be debated first.

The synod determined that as the Arminians were accused of departing from the faith they ought first to justify themselves by showing that their opinions were scriptural. Gomarus was particularly indignant with Episcopius for insisting that the conference should open with the question of reprobation. "Episcopius," cried he, "has falsified the tenet of reprobation. No man teaches that God has absolutely decreed to cast away men without sin; but as He did decree the *end* so did He decree the *means*, that is, as He predestinated man to *death* so He predestinated him to *sin*, the only way to death." "And so he mended the question," says Hales, "as tinkers mend kettles, and made it worse than before."

As no arrangement could be come to, the Arminians were banished the synod and their tenets tried in their absence. The president, Bogerman, had long been distinguished for his extreme bitterness against the followers of Arminius, and the official details of the synod fully bear out the fact that the synod was really summoned for the purpose of condemning, rather than of considering, the views of the Remonstrants. Still it must be admitted that the impolitic act of the Arminians gave their opponents an opportunity of exercising their bitterness, and enabled them to carry into effect their predetermined plan with greater success.

The synod sat until the 6th May, 1619, and consisted of 154 sessions, so some matters seem to have been well canvassed and thoroughly debated. It need hardly be said that the doctrine of the Arminians was condemned.[1]

[1] The abstract of the Articles as given in most of the works to be met with—specially we may mention Dr. Womock's "Examination of Tilenus," Dr. Heylyn's "Historia Quinqu-Articularis," and Dr. Tomline's "Refutation of Calvinism"—are so inaccurate

The effect of the synod was to draw the line more distinctly between the Calvinists and Arminians, and to cause a separation among many who had hitherto worked peacefully together. What advantage accrued to this country by the presence in the synod of four of the most eminent of her divines it is difficult to see; not sufficient, it is apprehended, to counterbalance the indecorum of seating bishops of her Church in a foreign assembly over which a

and give such a perverted view of the actual decisions of the Synod that the Articles themselves are here set forth so far as they affect the subject of predestination:—

1. As all men have sinned in Adam, and have become exposed to the curse and eternal death, God would have done no injustice to any one, if He had determined to leave the whole human race in sin and under the curse and to condemn them on account of sin; according to these words of the Apostle—"All the world is become guilty before God" (Rom. iii., 19); "All have sinned and come short of the glory of God" (Rom. iii., 23); and "The wages of sin is death" (Rom. vi., 23).

2. But "in this is the love of God manifested, that He sent His only begotten Son into the world, that everyone who believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life" (I. John iv., 9; John iii., 16).

3. And that men may be brought to faith, God mercifully sends heralds of this most joyful message, to whom He wills and when He wills, by whose ministry men are called to repentance and faith in Christ crucified. For "How shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach except they be sent?" (Rom. x. 14, 15).

4. They who believe not the Gospel on them the wrath of God remains: but those who receive it, and embrace the Saviour Jesus with a true and living faith, are through Him delivered from the wrath of God, and receive the gift of everlasting life.

5. The cause or fault of this unbelief, as also of all other sins, is by no means in God, but in man. But faith in Jesus Christ and salvation by Him is the free gift of God; as it is written, "By grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God" (Eph. ii., 8). In like manner, "It is given you to believe in Christ" (Phil. i., 29).

6. That some, *in time*, have faith given them by God, and others have it not given, proceeds from His eternal decree; for "Known unto God are all His works, from the beginning of the world" (Acts xv., 18; Eph. i., 11). According to which decree He graciously softens the hearts of the elect, however hard, and He bends them to believe; but the non-elect He leaves in just judgment to their own perversity and hardness. And here especially a deep discrimination at the same time both merciful and just, a discrimination of men equally lost, opens itself to us; or that decree of Election and Reprobation which is revealed in the word of God. Which as perverse, impure, and unstable persons do wrest to their own destruction, so it affords ineffable consolation to holy and pious souls.

7. But election is the immutable purpose of God, by which, before the foundation of the world, He chose, out of the whole human race, fallen by their own fault from their primeval integrity into sin and destruction, according to the most free good pleasure of His will and of mere grace, a certain number of men, neither better nor worthier than others, but lying in the same misery with the rest, to salvation in Christ, whom He had, even from eternity, constituted Mediator and Head of all the elect, and the foundation of salvation; and therefore He decreed to give them unto Him to be saved, and effectually to call and draw them into communion with Him by His own word and Spirit; that is, He decreed Himself to give unto them true faith, to justify, to sanctify, and at length powerfully to glorify them, having been kept in the communion of His Son; to the demonstration of His mercy and the praise of the riches of His glorious grace, as it is written, "God hath chosen us in Christ before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before Him in love; having predestinated us unto the adoption of children, by Jesus Christ to Himself, according to the good pleasure of His will, to the praise of the glory of His grace, wherein He hath freely made us accepted in the Beloved One" (Eph. i., 4-6). And in another place, "Whom He did predestinate, them He also called, and whom He called, them He also justified, and whom he justified, them He also glorified" (Rom. viii., 30).

8. This election is not manifold, but one and the same of all that shall be saved, in the Old and New Testament, seeing that the Scripture declares but one good pleasure, purpose, and counsel of the will of God, by which He has from eternity chosen us to grace and glory, both to salvation and the way of salvation which He has "before prepared that we should walk in it."

presbyter presided, and of their assisting in the suppressing of that party towards which the opinions of so many of the divines of their own church were rapidly approaching.

The views of the synod were Sublapsarian, and the majority looked upon the Supralapsarians as erring brethren only. Maccovius, a vehement Supralapsarian, made some most dangerous and blasphemous statements. He openly maintained in the synod that

9. This same election is not made from any foreseen faith, obedience of faith, holiness, or any other good quality or disposition, as a pre-requisite cause or condition in the man who should be elected, but *unto* faith, and *unto* the obedience of faith, holiness, &c. And therefore election is the fountain of every saving benefit; whence faith, holiness, and the other salutary gifts, and finally eternal life itself, flow as its fruit and effect, according to that word of the Apostle: "He hath chosen us" (not because we *were*, but) "that we *might* be holy and without blame before Him in love" (Eph. i., 4).

10. Now the true cause of this gratuitous election is the sole good pleasure of God, not consisting in this, that He elected into the condition of salvation certain qualities or human actions from all that were possible; but in that out of the common multitude of sinners, He took to Himself certain persons as His peculiar property, according to the Scripture: "For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, &c., it is said (that is to Rebecca), "The elder shall serve the younger": even as it is written, "Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated" (Rom. ix., 11-13); and, "As many as were ordained to eternal life, believed" (Acts xiii., 48).

11. And as God Himself is most wise, immutable, omniscient, and omnipotent, so election made by Him can neither be interrupted, changed, recalled, nor broken off; nor can the elect be cast away, nor the number of them be diminished.

12. Of this, His eternal and immutable election to salvation, the elect, though by various steps and in an unequal measure, are rendered certain; not indeed by curiously scrutinizing the deep and mysterious things of God, but by observing in themselves, with spiritual delight and holy pleasure, the infallible fruits of election described in God's word: such as true faith in Christ, filial fear of God, sorrow for sin, according unto God (λύπη κατὰ θεόν—godly sorrow), hungering and thirsting after righteousness, &c.

13. From the sense and assurance of this election the children of God daily find greater cause of humbling themselves before God, of adoring the abyss of His mercies, of purifying themselves, and of more ardently loving Him reciprocally who had before so loved them; so far are they from being rendered by this doctrine of election, and the meditation of it, more slothful in observing the Divine commands, or carnally secure. Wherefore, by the just judgment of God, it is wont to happen to those who either are rashly presuming or idly and forwardly prating about the grace of election, that they are not willing to walk in the ways of the elect.

14. But as this doctrine of divine election in the most wise counsel of God was predicated by the prophets, by Christ Himself, and by the Apostles, under the Old as well as under the New Testament, and then committed to the records of the sacred Scriptures: so it is to be declared at this day by the Church of God, to whom it is peculiarly destinated, with a spirit of discrimination in a holy and religious manner in its own place and time, all curious scrutinizing the ways of the Most High being laid aside: and this to the glory of the most holy divine name and for the lively solace of His people.

15. Moreover, Holy Scripture illustrates and commends to us this eternal and free grace of our election, in this more especially, that it also testifies all men not to be elected, but that some are non-elect, or passed by in the eternal election of God, whom truly God, from most free, just, irreprehensible and immutable good pleasure, decreed to leave in the common misery into which they had by their own fault cast themselves, and not to bestow upon them living faith and the grace of conversion: but leaving them in their own ways, and under just judgment, at length not only on account of their unbelief, but also of all their other sins, to condemn and eternally punish them to the manifestation of His own justice. And this is the decree of *Reprobation*, which determines that God is in no wise the author of sin (which to be thought of is blasphemy) but a tremendous, irreprehensible, just Judge and Avenger.

16. Those who do not as yet feel efficaciously in themselves a lively faith in Christ, or an assured confidence of heart, peace of conscience, earnest desire of filial obedience, glorying in God through Christ, yet nevertheless use the means by which God has promised to work these things in us, ought not to be alarmed by the mention of *Reprobation*, nor reckon themselves to be reprobate; but to use diligently the means of grace, and ardently to desire and reverently and humbly to expect the period of more abounding grace. And much less should those persons be terrified by the doctrine of reprobation

God willed sin—that He ordained sin as sin, and that by no means would He have all men to be saved. He had taught this also in his writings, where he expressly asserts that God calls to repentance for no other end than that men may be left without excuse, and if the Gospel be considered in respect of God's intention the proper end of it (and not the accidental) in reference to reprobates, is their inexcusability. And he further asserts that God speaks unto reprobates with no other object than that by the contempt and hatred of His only Son they may incur the greater condemnation.

When the synod had concluded its deliberations, it called upon all to subscribe to its acts,[1] fixing a day for conformity, and procured a proclamation from the States General banishing all refusing to subscribe from their native country with their wives and children.[2]

In this country no one was permitted to be ordained, or to preach, nor teach in a school, who did not hold the views put forth by the synod. In some places a man was not allowed even to hold the office of a parish clerk, a sexton, or an organist unless he was approved of by the triers or commissioners appointed for examining into the orthodoxy and abilities of such as were admitted to the ministry.

The canons of the Synod of Dort were far from being universally acknowledged among the Dutch; the Provinces of Friesland, Zeland, Utrecht, Guelderland, and Gröningen rejected them: and though, in the year 1651, the Provinces were at length gained over so far as to intimate that they would see with pleasure the reformed

who, when seriously converted to God, simply desire to please Him, and to be delivered from the body of death, yet cannot attain to what they wish in the path of faith and piety; because the merciful God has promised that He will not "quench the smoking flax, nor break the bruised reed." But this doctrine is justly for a terror to those who, forgetful of God and the Saviour Jesus Christ, have delivered themselves wholly to the cares and carnal pleasures of the world so long as they are not in earnest converted unto God.

17. Seeing that we are to judge of the will of God by His word, which testifies that the children of believers are holy, not indeed by nature but by the benefit of the gracious covenant in which they are comprehended along with their parents; pious parents ought not to doubt of the election and salvation of their children whom God has called in infancy out of this life.

18. Against those who murmur at this grace of gratuitous election and the severity of just reprobation we oppose this word of the Apostle, "O man, who art thou that repliest against God?" (Rom. ix. 20) and that of our Saviour, "Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own?" (Matt. xx. 15). We indeed, piously adoring these mysteries, exclaim with the Apostle, "Oh the depths of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are His judgments and His ways past finding out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord, or who hath been His counsellor? Or who hath first given to Him, and it shall be recompensed to him again? For of Him and through Him and to Him are all things: to whom be glory for ever. Amen."

[1] The Canons are subscribed by the officers of the Synod, by five divines of Great Britain, three of the Electoral Palatinate, four of Hesse, five of Switzerland, two of Wetteravia, two of Geneva, three of Bremen, two of Emden, five of the Netherlands, four of the Dukedom of Geldria and the County of Zutphen, five of South Holland, five of North Holland, five of Zeland, two of Utrecht, four of Friesland, six of Transsalania, six of Gröningen and Omland, two of Drent, and six of the French Netherlands.

[2] The Protestant clergy of France solemnly received and approved the decisions of the Synod of Dort in a National Synod held at Alez in 1619.

religion maintained upon the footing on which it had been placed and confirmed by the Synod of Dort, yet the most eminent adepts in Belgic jurisprudence deny that this intimation had the force or character of a law.

It is pretty generally known that shortly after the Synod of Dort, King James grew uneasy as to the extent and evil to which the predestinarian views of Calvin might be pressed. He became aware that the great Reformer's views generally were inimical to the monarchical interest, and in 1622 (Aug. 4) he caused certain orders and directions to be issued respecting preaching on the several disputed points, amongst which it was ordered "that no preacher, of what title soever (under the degree of a bishop or dean at the least), do from henceforth presume to teach in any popular auditory the deep points of predestination, election, reprobation, or of the universality, efficacity, resistibility, or irresistibility of God's grace, but rather leave these themes to be handled by learned men, and that modestly and moderately by use and application rather than by way of positive doctrine as being fitter for schools and universities than for simple auditors."

The subject was discussed in the Council of Trent, in 1547, and the true doctrine was declared to be as follows: That in adults the beginning of justification is to be taken from the preventing grace of God, through Jesus Christ, that is to say, from His calling, by which, without the existence of any merits on their parts, they are called; that so they, who through sins were turned away from God, may, through His quickening and assisting grace, be disposed to turn themselves unto their own justification, by freely assenting to, and co-operating with, that same grace; so that while God touches the heart of man by the illumination of the Holy Ghost, neither is man himself utterly inactive while he receives that inspiration, inasmuch as he is also able to reject it; yet is he not able without the grace of God, by his own freewill, to move himself unto justice in His sight.... we confess that we are prevented by the grace of God.[1]

Among the Tridentine Canons we find: If anyone shall say that without the preventing inspiration of the Holy Ghost and His help man can believe, hope, love, or be penitent as he ought, so that the grace of justification may be conferred upon him, let him be anathema;[2] If anyone shall affirm that man's freewill moved

[1] Declarat præterea ipsius justificationis exordium in adultis a Dei per Christum Jesum præveniente gratia sumendum esse, hoc est, ab ejus vocatione, qua, nullis eorum existentibus meritis, vocantur; ut, qui per peccata a Deo aversi erant, per ejus excitantem atque adjuvantem gratiam ad convertendum se ad suam ipsorum justificationem, eidem gratiæ libere assentiendo, et cooperando, disponantur: ita ut, tangente Deo cor hominis per Spiritus sancti illuminationem, neque homo ipse nihil omnino agat, inspirationem illam recipiens: quippe qui illam et abjicere potest, neque tamen sine gratia Dei movere se ad justitiam coram illo libera sua voluntate possit. . . . Dei nos gratia præveniri confitemur. —Sess. VI., cap v.

[2] Si quis dixerit sine præveniente Spiritus Sancti inspiratione, atque ejus adjutorio, hominem credere, sperare, diligere, aut pænitere posse sicut oportet, ut ei justificationis gratia conferatur; anathema sit.—Sess. VI. can. iii.

and excited by God, by assenting to God exciting and calling, nowise co-operates to the end that it should dispose and prepare itself for obtaining the grace of justification, and that it cannot refuse consent if it would, but that like something inanimate it does nothing whatever and is merely in a passive state, let him be anathema;[1] If anyone shall affirm that since the sin of Adam man's freewill is lost and extinguished, or, that it is a thing merely titular, yea, a title without a reality, a figment, in fine, introduced by Satan into the Church, let him be anathema.[2]

The latter was directly aimed at Luther, who, in his *De servo arbitrio,* had actually used these expressions. So far as the canons are condemnatory of Calvin's doctrine of the will, they are equally so of Augustine's. Indeed, it appears that some of Augustine's works concerning grace and against freewill are actually in the *Index Expurgatorius.* At least this is the testimony of Spanheimius: "In Doctrinam illius [Augustini] de *Gratiâ et libero arbitrio,* iniquiora sunt sæpe judicia Familiæ Jesuitarum et alia. Nec pauca Inquisitores Hispanici et Index Expurgatorius in Augustino damnant, obelo iis configenda."[3]

On the subject of final perseverance, the divines at the Council of Trent decided as follows: No man so long as he exists in this mortal state ought so far to presume on the secret mystery of divine predestination as to determine for certain that he is assuredly within the number of the predestinated, as if it were true that he who is justified either cannot sin any more, or if he have sinned he ought to promise himself a certain repentance; for except by a special revelation it cannot be known whom God hath chosen unto Himself.[4] The Council consequently declared: If anyone shall say that a man, who is born again and justified, is bound of faith to believe that he is assuredly in the number of the predestinated, let him be anathema;[5] If anyone shall say that he will for certain of an absolute and infallible certainty have that great gift of perseverance unto the end, unless that he have learnt this by a special revelation, let him be anathema;[6] If anyone shall

[1] Si quis dixerit liberum hominis arbitrium à Deo motum et excitatum, nihil co-operari assentiendo Deo excitanti atque vocanti, quo, ad obtinendam justificationis gratiam se disponat, ac præparet, neque posse dissentire si velit, sed veluti inanime quoddam nihil omnino agere, merèque passive se habere; anathema sit.—Conc. Trid. Sess. VI., can. iv.

[2] Si quis liberum hominis arbitrium post Adæ peccatum amissum et extinctum esse dixerit, aut Rem esse de solo titulo, imo titulum sine re, figmentum denique à Satanâ invectum in Ecclesiam; anathema sit.—*Ib.*, can. v.

[3] Spanheim.—Oper., vol. I. p. 925.

[4] Nemo quoque, quamdiu in hac mortalitate vivitur, de arcano divinæ prædestinationis mysterio usque adeo præsumere debet, ut certo statuat se omnino esse in numero prædestinatorum: quasi verum esset, quod justificatus aut amplius peccare non possit, aut, si peccaverit, certam sibi resipiscentiam promittere debeat: nam, nisi ex speciali revelatione, sciri non potest quos Deus sibi elegerit.—Sess. VI., can. xii.

[5] Si quis dixerit hominem renatum et justificatum teneri ex fide ad credendum se certo esse in numero prædestinatorum: anathema sit.—Sess. VI., can. xv.

[6] Si quis magnum illud usque in finem perseverantiæ donum se certo habiturum, absoluta et infallibili certitudine dixerit, nisi hoc ex speciali revelatione didicerit: anathema sit.—*Ib.*, xvi.

say that the grace of justification only befalleth those who are predestinated unto life, but that all others who are called are called indeed but receive not grace, as being by the divine power predestinated unto evil, let him be anathema;[1] If anyone shall say that a man once justified cannot sin, nor lose grace, and that therefore he that falls and sins was never truly justified, or, on the other hand, that he is able throughout his whole life to avoid all sins, even those that are venial, except by a special privilege from God .... let him be anathema.[2]

The Council found no fault with the doctrine of predestination as laid down in the then existing Protestant Confessions in express terms, but they strongly condemned the doctrine as held by the Zuinglians, whose views on this point were somewhat similar to Calvin's.

While the Council of Trent was yet sitting, a controversy broke out between Michael Bajus and his colleagues, who were followers of Scotus, and 76 propositions of Bajus, several of which were literally taken from Augustine's writings, were condemned by a bull of Pope Pius V., in 1567, and the condemnation was subsequently confirmed in 1579 by Gregory XIII.

As to whether the Church of England has followed and adopted the views of Calvin on predestination and election, her Articles, Liturgy, and Homilies must speak for themselves.

Her intention, as declared by the 2nd and 3rd Ed. VI., was "to have an eye in the first place to the most pure and sincere Christian religion taught in the Scriptures, and in the next place to the usages of the Primitive Church."

The Reformers in this country conformed much to the authority of Melancthon and somewhat to that of Erasmus, whose paraphrase on the Evangelists was ordered to be kept in the churches for the use of the people. In fact, the injunctions of Edward VI., published by the advice of Lord Protector Somerset and the Privy Council, in the first year of his reign, directed this: "1. That they should see provided, in some convenient and open place in every Church, one great Bible in English, with the paraphrase of Erasmus in English, that the people might reverently, without any let, read and hear the same at such time as they liked, and not to be inhibited therefrom by the parson or curate but rather to be the more encouraged and provoked thereunto. And 2. That every priest under the degree of a Bachelor of Divinity should have of his own one New Testament in English and Latin, with the para-

[1] Si quis justificationis gratiam non nisi prædestinatis ad vitam contingere dixerit; reliquos vero omnes qui vocantur, vocari quidem, sed gratiam non accipere, utpote divina potestate prædestinatos ad malum: anathema sit.—*Ib.*, xvii.

[2] Si quis hominem semel justificatum dixerit amplius peccare non posse, neque gratiam amittere, atque ideo eum qui labitur, et peccat, nunquam vere fuisse justificatum, aut contra, posse in tota vita peccata omnia, etiam venialia, vitare, nisi ex speciali Dei privilegio .... anathema sit.—*Ib.*, xxiii.

phrase of Erasmus upon the same, and should diligently read and study thereupon, and should collect and keep in memory all such comfortable places of the Scriptures as do set forth the mercy, benefits, and goodness of Almighty God towards all penitent and believing persons, and that they might thereby comfort their flock in all danger of death, despair, or trouble of conscience; and that therefore every bishop in their institution should from time to time try and examine them how they have profited in their studies."

It must, however, be remembered that the paraphrase on the Book of Revelation was not by Erasmus but was translated from the Latin of Leo Jude, a minister of the Tigurine Church, for that contains a number of sentiments unequivocally Calvinistic.

Many Calvinists have claimed the Articles as expressly framed to favour their views and to exclude Arminianism, and on the other hand many Arminians have claimed them as expressly framed to exclude Calvinism, but each claim is equally invalid. It would not be difficult to show that they were adopted to embrace both and with the object of excluding neither party.

It is true that the first Reformers in this country seem to have held views on the subject of predestination closely resembling the Sublapsarian scheme, and to have had a general tendency to Calvin's views.[1] But whatever their private sentiments may have been they never taught in such a dogmatic mode as Calvin the doctrine of absolute decrees. In framing the Articles the authors may have worked on the same foundation with the Genevese Reformer, but they did not proceed to his height. They saw the dangers and pitfalls incident to a scheme like Calvin's, and took a more accurate view of the capacity of the human understanding to comprehend the whole of the Divine plan in relation to the creature. They evidently desired to frame a public confession as nearly as possible identical with the very words of inspiration, comprehensive enough to embrace in general terms various different parties, leaving as much as possible to be resolved on the principle of human ignorance.

The Articles were framed by Cranmer with the assistance of Ridley. Strype conceives "that the archbishop was the framer, or at least the greater director of them, with the assistance, as is very probable, of Bishop Ridley."[2] When interrogated on the subject by his enemies, under Queen Mary, the last part of his

[1] Prynne goes so far as to state that up to the time he wrote, 1630, he could mention only five men who had come forward publicly to defend Arminianism. These were Baro, Thompson (1614), Montague, Bishop of Chichester and after of Norwich, and Dr. Thomas Jackson. Of course this is gross exaggeration.

[2] Neal's statement in his history of the Puritans, vol. i., p. 49, "that it was resolved in Council to reform the Doctrine of the Church, and that Archbishop Cranmer and Bishop Ridley were appointed to this work," is inaccurate.

answer to this was: "As for the Catechism, the Book of Articles, with the other book against Winchester, he grants the same to be his doings."[1]

There is little doubt that Melancthon was the authority whom Cranmer usually consulted. The correspondence between these two began as early as 1535, and though in the earlier part of his life Melancthon held views in common with Luther on the subject of predestination, views distinctly Calvinistic, he subsequently, as we have pointed out, changed his opinion. Both Luther and Melancthon held the doctrine of philosophical necessity till the year 1527. Certainly in the form of doctrine drawn up in that year for the Churches of Saxony, freewill in acts of morality was thus inculcated "Voluntas humana est ita libera, ut facere aliquo modo possit justitiam carnis seu justitiam civilem, ubi lege et vi cogitur, ut *non furari, non occidere, non mœchari* ... Propterea doceant, in nostra manu aliquo modo esse carnem frænare, et civilem justitiam præstare; *et hortentur diligenter ad recte vivendum, quia Deus hanc quoque justitiam exigit*, et graviter puniet illos, qui adeo negligenter vivunt. Nam sicut aliis donis Dei bene uti debemus, ita etiam viribus, quas Deus naturæ tribuit, bene uti debemus."[2].

That Melancthon not only abandoned but reprehended the doctrine in 1529 is clear. In a letter to Christopher Stathmio, not long before his death, he thus notices the subject: "Apud Homerum fortissimus bellator optat concordiam his verbis; *ὡς ἔρις ἔκ τε θεῶν, ἔκ τ' ἀνθρώπων, απόλοιτο.* Quanto magis me senem et infirmum optare pacem consentaneum est? *Ante annos triginta*, non studio contentionis, sed propter gloriam Dei, et propter disciplinam, *reprehendi* Stoica paradoxa de necessitate, *quia et contra Deum contumeliosa sunt*, et nocent moribus. Nunc mihi bellum inferunt Stoicorum phalanges, sed in qua sententia possint acquiescere mentes anxiæ, rursus moderate exposui in responsione quam Bavaricæ inquisitioni opposui. . . . ."[3] And in the tract to which he himself alludes the following unequivocal language is employed: "*Palam etiam rejicio et detestor Stoicos et Manichæos furores*, qui affirmant omnia *necessario* fieri bonas et malas actiones, de quibus omitto hic longiores disputationes. Tantum oro juniores, ut fugiant *has monstrosas opiniones*, quæ sunt contumeliosæ contra Deum, et perniciosæ moribus."

In 1535 he expunged the objectionable tenets which had been contained in the first edition of his *Loci Theologici*. It is well known that Luther himself approved of the change in Melancthon's opinions (though as we have already said this has been

[1] Burnet's *Hist. of the Reformation.*

[2] Cap. de Libero Arbitrio.

[3] March 30th, 1559.

denied), and never taught the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination after his controversy with Erasmus respecting freewill.[1]

In the Helvetic Confession, framed in 1536,[2] and drawn up more at large in 1566, when it was approved of by all the Churches of England, Scotland, France, and the Netherlands, and by many of Poland, Hungary, and Germany, the doctrine of freewill is thus stated: "At the fall man turned aside to what was evil, and brought upon himself and the whole human race sin and death." "Since the fall the understanding is not removed, nor the will taken away, nor is man changed into a stone or trunk; but these powers are so changed or inspired that"—"his understanding is darkened, and his will, from being free, is become enslaved. For he serves sin, not unwillingly, but willingly. With regard to the evil, therefore, man does not commit it from any force put upon him either by God or Satan, but of his own accord, having in this respect the most free choice." "But as to what is good, the understanding of man judges not of itself rightly concerning divine things." "The unrenewed have no free choice towards good, and no power to perform it." "In regeneration, the understanding is illuminated by the Holy Spirit to understand the mysteries and the will of God. And the will itself is not only changed by the Spirit but also furnished with powers spontaneously to will and to effect that which is good." "The regenerate in the choice and performance of what is good do not act only passively, but actively. They moved by God that they themselves may do what they do."

The Helvetic Confession was no doubt highly esteemed by the Reformers in this country. Jewel, in writing to Peter Martyr, in 1559, says, "We have presented all the articles of our religion and doctrine to the Queen, and we have not departed in the smallest point from the Confession of Zurich." And again in 1562 he writes thus: "As to opinions, we have cut off every error to the very quick, and we are not so much as a nail's breadth distant from your doctrine," viz., "in the Helvetian School." So Grindal, in writing to Bullinger, in 1566, states that "Many did endeavour

[1] Luther very candidly admitted, in his "Commentary on Genesis," his last work of importance, that at the beginning of the Reformation his creed was not completely settled, and he points out the qualifications with which all he said on the doctrine of absolute necessity ought to be received, "Vos ergo, qui nunc me audistis, meminceritis me hoc docuisse, *Non esse inquirendum de Prædestinatione Dei absconditi*, sed in illis acquiescendum, quæ revelantur per vocationem et per ministerium verbi . . . Hæc eadem autem alibi quoque in meis libris protestatus sum, et nunc etiam viva voce trado: *Ideo sum excusatus*."—Op., vol. VI., p. 355. It is but fair to state that Luther's change of opinion is strenuously opposed by some. The Duke of Saxony, in the Preface to the Corp. Doct., says, "They are bewitched with the frauds of the devil who say that Luther's book was ever retracted;" and Schlusselburgh, in his Catalogue of Heretics (lib. IV.), employs language equally decisive. "The evil spirit," says he, "cannot produce a more evident lie than this, that Luther recanted his opinion De servo arbitrio."

[2] It was composed at a synod in Basle by theologians deputed by the cities of Zurich, Berne, Basle, Schafhausen, St. Galen, Muhlhausen, and Biel, especially by H. Bullinger, Oswald Myconius, Simon Grynaeus, Leo Judä, and Caspar Grosmann, with the assistance of Bucer and Capito, the delegates from Strasburg.

to bring into the Church a doctrine different from the pure and sincere profession, as it was embraced by the Churches of Helvetia," but "to that day the Church of England did fully consent with the Helvetian Churches and their Confession lately published."

These observations must be taken as referring to the doctrine generally expressed, for as a matter of fact the Helvetian Confession of 1536 had no article on predestination. The chapter on this subject was not inserted till 1566, when the doctrine was even more guardedly expressed than in the English Articles. The Article was as follows: God has from the beginning, freely and of His own mere favour, without any respect of persons, predestinated or elected the saints, whom He will save in Christ, according to what the Apostle has said, 'God has chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world;' and again, 'Who hath saved us and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to His own purpose and grace, which was given to us through Christ Jesus before the world was, but is now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ.' Therefore God did not choose us without some medium, although that medium be not any merit in us; but He chose us in Christ, and for Christ's sake, so that they who now are grafted into Christ by faith are also His elect, and they who are not in Christ are reprobates, according to the saying of the Apostle: 'Examine yourselves whether ye be in the faith: know ye not your own selves how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates?' Lastly, the saints are chosen in Christ by God to a certain end; which also the Apostle declares, saying, 'He has chosen us in Him that we should be holy and without blame before Him in love, who has predestinated us that He might adopt us to be sons through Jesus Christ unto Himself and that His glorious grace might be praised.' The rest of the chapter guards chiefly against the abuse of the doctrine.

In a brief confession of Faith made with general consent by the ministers and heads of families of the Churches of the Valleys of Piedmont, assembled in Augrogne, September 12, 1532, and said to contain the doctrine delivered to them by tradition from their forefathers, are these three articles:—

1. All those that have been and shall be saved have been elected of God before the foundation of the world.

2. It is impossible that those that are appointed to salvation should not be saved.

3. Whosoever upholds freewill denies absolutely predestination and the grace of God.

And in another confession of the same Churches, published in 1655, which consisted of 33 Articles, the 11th and the 26th are these:—

God saves from corruption and condemnation those whom He

hath chosen from the foundation of the world, not for any disposition, faith, or holiness that He saw in them but of His mere mercy in Jesus Christ His Son, passing by all the rest according to the irreprehensible reason of His freewill and justice.

The Church cannot err nor be annihilated, but must endure for ever; and all the elect are upheld and preserved by the power of God in such way that they all persevere in faith unto the end and remain united in the holy Church as so many living members thereof.[1]

A comparison of the English Articles and those of the Augsburg Confession drawn up by Melancthon (assisted by Luther and Pomeranus) in 1530, shows pretty clearly how their framers agreed. An agreement in the subject matter of Article 17 of course cannot be shown as the confession referred to, as also the Confession of Wirtemberg, in 1551, expressly excluded the consideration of the subject of predestination as needless and as leading to no good end. "Non est hic opus disputationibus de prædestinatione aut similibus. Nam promissio est universalis et nihil detrahit operibus, imo exsuscitat ad fidem et vere bona opera."[2]

The Saxon Confession, published in 1551, speaks yet more plainly. "Quia conscientiis in pœnitentia consolationem proponimus, non addimus hic quæstiones de Prædestinatione, seu de Electione; sed deducimus omnes lectores ad verbum Dei; et jubemus, ut voluntatem Dei ex verbo ipsius discant, sicut Æternus Pater expressâ voce præcipit, *Hunc audite.* Non quærant alias speculationes."[3]

In the Belgic Confession of Faith, first written in French in

[1] In the Confession of Faith exhibited to Charles IX. in France, in 1561, Calvinism certainly is as strongly held as in the Dort Synod. The 12th Article is—Credimus ex hac corruptione et damnatione universali, in qua omnes homines natura sunt submersi, Deum alios quidem eripere, quos videlicet æterno et immutabili suo consilio, sola sua bonitate et misericordia, nulloque operum ipsorum respectu, in Jesu Christo elegit: alios vero in ea corruptione et damnatione relinquere, in quibus nimirum juste suo tempore damnandis justitiam suam demonstret, sicut in aliis divitias misericordiæ suæ declarat. Neque enim alii aliis meliores sunt donec illos Deus discernat, ex immutabili illo consilio quod ante seculorum creationem in Jesu Christo determinavit; neque posset quisquam sua vi sibi ad bonum illud aditum patefacere, quum ex natura nostra ne unum quidem rectum motum vel affectum seu cogitationem habere possimus, donec nos Deus gratis præveniat et ad rectitudinem formet. The 4th Article of the public determinations of the Electorate of Saxony is very distinct: De Prædestinatione et æterna providentia Dei. *Pura et vera doctrina nostrarum Ecclesiarum de hoc articulo.*

1. Quòd Christus pro omnibus hominibus mortuus sit, et ceu Agnus Dei totius mundi peccata sustulerit.

2. Quòd Deus neminem ad condemnationem conderit, sed velit, ut omnes homines salvi fiant et ad agnitionem veritatis perveniant; propterea omnibus mandet, ut Filium suum Christum in Evangelio audiant, et per hunc auditum promittit virtutem et operationem Spiritus Sancti ad conversionem et salutem.

3. Quòd multi homines propriâ culpâ pereant; alii qui Evangelium de Christo nolunt audire; alii, qui iterum excidunt de gratiâ, sive per errores contra fundamentum, sive per peccata contra conscientiam.

4. Quòd omnes peccatores, pœnitentiam agentes, in gratiam recipiantur, et nemo excludatur, etsi peccata ejus rubeant ut sanguis; quandoquidem Dei misericordia major est quam peccata totius mundi, et Deus omnium suorum operum miseretur.

[2] Aug. Con. Art. 20 *De Fide.*

[3] Art. *De Remissione Peccatorum, et Justificatione.*

1566 and confirmed in 1579 in the Synod of the Netherlands, we find the doctrine of freewill thus treated: "We deservedly reject whatever is said concerning the freewill of man, since he is the servant of sin, and can do nothing except it be given him from heaven. For who dares to boast he can effect whatever he pleases when Christ Himself says 'No man can come unto Me, except the Father who hath sent Me draw him?' Who can be ostentatious of his own will, when he hears that the affections of the flesh are enmity against God? Who will glory of his own understanding who knows that the carnal man receives not the things of the Spirit of God? Upon the whole who can bring forward even a single thought of his own when he understands that we are not able of ourselves to think anything but that our sufficiency is of God? What the Apostle therefore says should remain certain and unmoved. It is God who worketh in us to will and to do of His good pleasure. No mind nor will acquiesces in the will of God, except when Christ hath first wrought; which He Himself teaches us when He says 'Without Me, ye can do nothing.'"

The article on election is: "We believe that God (after that the whole offspring of Adam was cast headlong into perdition and destruction through the default of the first man) hath declared and showed Himself to be such a one as He is indeed, namely, both merciful and just; merciful, by delivering and saving those from condemnation and from death whom, in His eternal counsel, of His own free goodness, He hath chosen in Jesus Christ our Lord, without any regard at all of their works: but just, in leaving others in that their fall and perdition, whereinto they had thrown themselves headlong."

The 17th Article of the English Church runs as follows:—

Predestination to life[1] is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid) He hath constantly decreed by His counsel secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation those whom He hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honour. Wherefore they which be endued with so excellent a benefit of God be called according to God's purpose by His Spirit working in due season;[2] they through grace obey the calling; they be justified freely, they be made sons of God by adoption; they be made like the image of His only begotton Son Jesus Christ; they walk religiously in good works, and at length, by God's mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity.

As the godly consideration of predestination, and our election in

[1] Predestination is always used in Scripture in a good sense; no persons are said to be predestinated to death or to punishment or to unbelief. Nefas est dicere Deum aliquid nisi bonum prædestinare. Aug., *de Præd.*, cap. ii.

[2] *Spiritu ejus opportuno tempore operante*, by His Spirit operating not irresistibly at pleasure without regard to time or circumstances, but conformably to the constitution of human nature at a seasonable period.

Christ, is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons and such as feel in themselves the working of the Spirit of Christ, mortifying the works of the flesh and their earthly members, and drawing up their mind to high and heavenly things, as well because it doth greatly establish and confirm their faith of eternal salvation to be enjoyed through Christ,[1] as because it doth fervently kindle their love towards God; so, for curious and carnal persons, lacking the Spirit of Christ, to have continually before their eyes the sentence of God's Predestination is a most dangerous downfall, whereby the Devil doth thrust them either into desperation, or into wretchlessness of most unclean living, no less perilous than desperation.

Furthermore,[2] we must receive God's promises in such wise as they be generally set forth to us in Holy Scripture; and, in our doings, that Will of God is to be followed which we have expressly declared unto us in the Word of God.[3]

The words of warning with which the article closes were fully justified by the attitude of the several parties in the Church. Men's mind in those days sought after obtuse and metaphysical positions rather than contented itself with the great practical reality of religion. They relegated almost all the solemn truths of Christianity to the region of pure intellect, and their notions consequently of predestination and election were of the most exaggerated character. This caveat at the end is alleged by Arminians to be a proof that the article favours their hypothesis, but it seems to us to be one of the strongest points in favour of the view that the preceding portion of the article intended to declare for predestina-

[1] In the original it will be observed it is "fidem *nostram* de æterna salute consequenda per Christum"—*our* confidence in Christian salvation generally and not theirs particularly. So the words further on translated "their love," are "amorem *nostrum*." The pronoun *noster* is important as seeming to impress the idea of an election not so much of men as individuals but as a body.

[2] As the Article shows, in 1552 the following words were inserted here: "though the decrees of predestination be unknown to us, yet". See the comparison of the Article in the Collection of Records subjoined to Burnet's History of the Reformation.

[3] Prædestinatio ad vitam, est æternum Dei propositum, quo ante jacta mundi fundamenta, suo consilio, nobis quidem occulto, constanter decrevit, eos quos in Christo elegit ex hominum genere, a maledicto et exitio liberare, atque (ut vasa in honorem efficta) per Christum, ad æternam salutem adducere. Unde qui tam præclaro Dei beneficio sunt donati, illi spiritu ejus, opportuno tempore operante, secundum propositum ejus vocantur, vocationi per gratiam parent, justificantur gratis, adoptantur in filios Dei, unigeniti ejus Jesu Christi imagini efficiuntur conformes, in bonis operibus sancte ambulant, et demum ex Dei misericordia pertingunt ad sempiternam felicitatem. Quemadmodum prædestinationis et electionis nostræ in Christo pia consideratio, dulcis, suavis, et ineffabilis consolationis plena est vere piis, et his qui sentiunt in se vim spiritus Christi, facta carnis, et membra, quæ adhuc sunt super terram, mortificantem, animumque ad cœlestia et superna rapientem; tum quia fidem nostram de æterna salute consequenda per Christum plurimum stabilit atque confirmat, tum quia amorem nostrum in Deum vehementer accendit: ita hominibus curiosis carnalibus, et Spiritu Christi destitutis, ob oculos perpetuo versari prædestinationis Dei sententiam, perniciosissimum est præcipitium, unde illos diabolus protrudit, vel in desperationem, vel in æque perniciosam, impurissimæ vitæ securitatem; deinde promissiones divinas sic amplecti oportet, ut nobis in sacris literis generaliter propositæ sunt, et Dei voluntas in nostris actionibus ea sequenda est, quam in verbo Dei habemus, diserte revelatam.

tion in a Calvinistic sense, for it is the scheme of Calvin, not of Arminius, which requires such a caution.

Arminians contend that, as in the definition in the article, predestination presupposes a condition of curse into which all mankind has fallen in the sight of the Almighty, the Supralapsarian hypothesis is not favoured. And again, that by reason of the assertion that predestination is the everlasting purpose of God whereby *before* the foundation of the world He decreed to deliver from curse and damnation those whom He hath chosen in Christ, the Sublapsarian hypothesis, which places the absolute decree of predestination to life and of reprobation to death after the decree of sending the only Begotten of the Father into the world to be the propitiation for the sins of the world, is excluded. Further, they assert that as the article lays it down that the elect in Christ shall be brought by Christ, *but not without their own consent and co-operation* to everlasting salvation, irresistible decrees are discountenanced. Calvinists, however, with some reason deny the force of these arguments and inferences.

It will be observed that nothing is declared in the article either as to the cause of election or on the doctrine of reprobation; the latter is no doubt purposely left to inference, if it may fairly be inferred from the doctrine of predestination as stated. Let us remember what Dr. Hampden, in his Bampton Lectures, well points out, that the theory of predestination is only a theory of God's mercy in Christ deduced from its originating cause in the Being of God, while reprobation on the other hand is a theory of the origin of evil, and so far therefore from being deducible from our doctrinal statements on predestination and grace is the very doctrine to which these statements are opposed, unless, as he says, we are to suppose, that a philosophical theology, in which the framers of our articles had been trained, had no influence on their minds.

Though the article may have been framed so as not to exclude either Calvinists or Arminians, we do not consider it teaches any such thing as election directly to eternal life in the sense in which election is understood either by Calvin or Arminius. What is taught is an election into the Church that indirectly and mediately those elected may be brought to everlasting salvation. This is clear from the fact of the assumption of the possibility of the elect individually departing from grace; a doctrine which is even more distinctly set forth in the Homilies, where it is shown that not only may the elect fall from grace but may perish everlastingly. The elect are not said to be arbitrarily chosen, but chosen *in* Christ and brought *by* Him to everlasting salvation.

It is true that in the beginning of the article the expression "predestination to life" is used, which seems to give force to the claims of the Arminians and Calvinists, but it must be remembered that this expression is equally suitable to those who hold what is

known as ecclesiastical election, that is, election into the Church by means of the sacrament of baptism; for baptism is regarded by them as *election to life* and as "*deliverance from curse and damnation,*" as the words of the article run. The framers of the article held truly that the Church is that body which is delivered from curse and damnation by the offering of Christ, and is destined to life eternal. Holy baptism is for the remission of sins—for deliverance from the curse of original sin. The benefits of the death of Christ are applied, and the life of the Head is imparted, to the members of the Body in one and the same act. This is the election of God. It is an election to life eternal, not immediate and direct, but mediate.

This then is the true meaning of the article and what was possibly in the mind of the framers, but it cannot be denied that in the choice of words adopted for the expression of their meaning they seem purposely to have aimed at comprehending persons holding various views on the subject, and of embracing, by the employment of general terms, as large a body and as varied a class as possible.

It is worthy of note that the word rendered "*generally*" in the article is not employed as opposed to "*usually*" but as applied to "*particularly,*" the Latin form used being "generaliter," not "plerumque."

The judicious observations of Dr. Waterland[1] on the article are quoted as well deserving of careful consideration. "The article of predestination has been vainly enough urged in favour of the Calvinistical tenets. For not to mention the saving clauses in the conclusion, or its saying nothing at all of reprobation, and nothing in favour of *absolute* predestination to life, there seems to be a plain distinction (as Plaifere has well observed) in the article itself of two kinds of predestination, one of which is recommended to us and the other condemned . . . . Predestination, rightly and piously considered, that is, considered (not *irrespectively*, not *absolutely* but) with respect to faith in Christ, faith working by love, and persevering; such a predestination is a sweet and comfortable doctrine. But the sentence of God's predestination (it is not here said *in Christ* as before), that sentence *simply or absolutely* considered (as *curious* and *carnal* persons are apt to consider it), is a most *dangerous downfall*, leading either to *security* or *desperation*, as having no respect to foreseen *faith* and a *good life*, nor depending upon it, but *antecedent* in order to it. The article then seems to speak of two subjects, first of predestination soberly understood with respect to faith *in Christ*, which is wholesome doctrine; secondly, of predestination *simply* considered, which is a dangerous doctrine. And the latter part seems to be intended against those gospellers whereof Bishop Burnet speaks. Nor is it imaginable

[1] Supplement to the case of Arian subscription, p. 57.

that any *true* and *sound* doctrine of the Gospel should of itself have any aptness to become a *downfall* even to *carnal* persons, but *carnal* persons are apt to corrupt a sound doctrine and suit it to their own lusts and passions, thereby falsifying the truth. This doctrine, so depraved and mistaken, our Church condemns. That is, she condemns *absolute irrespective* predestination, not the other."[1]

The article seems to have been framed with all the godly fear of Ridley, who thus expresses himself in language well worthy of remembrance. "In these matters I am so fearful that I dare not speak further, yea almost none otherwise than the text doth, as it were, lead me by the hand." The phraseology of the article is studiously confined to the very letter of Scripture. Thus:—

"Before the foundations of the world were laid."	"According as He hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world."—Eph. i. 4.
"To deliver from curse and damnation those whom he hath chosen in Christ,[2] and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation as vessels made to honour."	"Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law being made a curse for us."—Gal. iii. 13. "In whom we have redemption through His blood."—Eph. i. 7. "That...He might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth, even in Him in whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of Him who worketh all things after the counsel of His own will."—Eph. i. 10, 11. "And that He might make known the riches of His glory on the vessels of mercy which He had afore prepared unto glory."—Rom. ix. 23.

[1] See Bishop Latimer's Sermon on the 3rd Sunday after Epiphany, where he exhorts all to "keepe from all curious and dangerous questions, when we heare that some be chosen and some be damned." "Let us," he says, "have good hope that we shall be amongst the chosen, and live after this hope, that is uprightly and godly, then shalt thou not be deceived. Think that God hath chosen those that believe in Christ, and that Christ is the booke of life. If thou beleevest in Him, then thou art written in the booke of life, and shalt be saved. So we need not go about to trouble ourselves with curious questions on the predestination of God, but let us rather endeavour ourselves that we may be in Christ; for when we be in Him then are we well, and then we may be sure that we are ordained to everlasting life."

[2] As S. Ambrose says "sicut elegit nos in ipso—as He hath chosen us in Him. Præscivit enim Deus omnes scil. qui credituri essent in Christum—for God by His general prescience did foreknow every man that would believe in Christ."

"Called according to God's purpose by His Spirit working in due season. They through grace obey the calling."	"We know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to His purpose."—Rom. viii. 28. "Who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to His own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus."—2 Tim. i. 9. "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit unto obedience."—1 Peter i. 2.
"They be justified freely."	"Being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus."—Rom. iii. 24.
"They be made sons of God by adoption."	"To redeem them that were under the law that we might receive the adoption of sons."—Gal. iv. 5.
"They be made like the image of His only begotten Son Jesus Christ."	"Whom He did foreknow He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son."—Rom. viii. 29.
"They walk religiously in good works."	"Created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them."—Eph. ii. 10.
"And at length by God's mercy they attain everlasting felicity."	"Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world."—Matt. xxv. 34.

The late Bishop of Brechin was of opinion that the Article is Augustinian and not Calvinistic, but this is somewhat doubtful. That it is not exclusively Calvinistic may be clear, but that it is Augustinian is by no means clear. This will be more apparent when we come to consider Augustine and Calvin's views further in detail.

Extreme Calvinism certainly does not appear in the Liturgy. It opens, "When the wicked man turneth away from his wickedness that he hath committed and doeth that which is lawful and right, he shall save his soul alive."[1] In the Litany, "O God the

[1] Ezek. xviii., 27.

Son, Redeemer of the *world*." "That it may please Thee to have mercy upon *all men*." "O Lamb of God that taketh away the sins *of the world*." In the General Thanksgiving we bless God "for His inestimable love in the redemption *of the world* by our Lord Jesus Christ." In the Collects we meet with such petitions and expressions as these: "Almighty and everlasting God who of Thy tender love towards *mankind* hast sent Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ to take upon Him our flesh and to suffer death upon the cross that *all mankind* should follow the example of His great humility." And in the Exhortation to Communion: "Ye must give most humble and hearty thanks to God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost for the redemption *of the world* by the death and passion of our Saviour Christ." In the "comfortable words": "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son to the end that all that believe in Him should not perish but have everlasting life." "This is a true saying and worthy of all men to be received, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." "*If any man* sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the Righteous; and he is the propitiation for our sins." In the Preface on Easter Day: "Jesus Christ is the very Paschal Lamb which was offered for us, and hath taken away the sin *of the world*." In the Prayer of Consecration: "Almighty God our Heavenly Father, who of Thy tender mercy didst give Thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption: who made there (by His one oblation of Himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the *whole world*." In the Gloria in Excelsis: "Thou that takest away the sins *of the world*, have mercy upon us." In the Catechism: "First, I learn to believe in God the Father who hath made me and all the world; Secondly, in God the Son, who hath redeemed me and *all mankind*; Thirdly, in God the Holy Ghost, who sanctifieth me and all the elect people of God."

In the Baptismal Service it is clearly shown that every child brought to be baptised is capable of attaining everlasting salvation.[1] The privileges of baptism are first set forth in the address

[1] So there is a paragraph in the Burial Service most difficult for extreme or high Calvinists to explain. It is the following: "Suffer us not, at our last hour, for any pains of death, to *fall from Thee*." They indeed endeavour to explain away its meaning by asserting that the expression only relates to a fall from a *fictitious* faith, but Archbishop Laurence, by tracing the expression to its real source, has shown that the contrary is the fact. The passage in which it is found was, as he says, taken from a German hymn of Luther, composed as a kind of poetical paraphrase upon another very ancient one in the offices of the Romish Church. The words of Luther in the latter part of this hymn are, "Heiliger Herre Gott, heiliger starker Gott, heiliger harmbertziger Heyland, du ewiger Gott, lass uns nicht entfallen von des rechten glaubens trost." (*Geistliches Handbuchlein*, p. 136.) "O holy Lord God, O holy mighty God, O holy merciful Saviour, Thou God eternal, suffer us not *to fall from the consolation of true faith*." To ascertain, therefore, the precise meaning of the terms in our Liturgy, nothing more seems requisite than to compare them with the original. Indeed to consider a fall *from* God as meaning a fall from *an ideal faith* in God is a species of forced interpretation, in itself not easily admissible.—*Bampton Lectures, note on Sermon*, viii.

made by the priest to the congregation: "Dearly beloved, forasmuch as all men are conceived and born in sin, and that our Saviour Christ saith, none can enter into the kingdom of God except he be regenerate and born anew of water and of the Holy Ghost, I beseech you to call upon God the Father, through our Lord Jesus Christ, that of His bounteous mercy He will grant to this child that thing which by nature he cannot have, that he may be baptized with water and the Holy Ghost, and received into Christ's holy Church and be made a lively member of the same." Three specific things are here prayed for: First, That the child may be baptised with water and the Holy Ghost, that the Spirit of God may accompany the act of His servant in this holy ordinance; Secondly, That the child may be received into Christ's holy Church, that he may be admitted to all the privileges which belong to members of that body whereof Christ is the Head, all the privileges of the communion of saints, the love of God and of their brethren, knowledge and edification, strength and comfort, and that "effectual working in every part," as the Apostle speaks, by which the body "maketh increase of itself in love." That he may become a member of this body, a branch of the true Vine, and partaker of the fulness thereof; Thirdly, That the child may be made a lively or living member of Christ's body. This shows that the grace given may be forfeited, that the Spirit may be resisted, grieved, even quenched; that he who has a new and spiritual life bestowed upon him may fall back into a deadly state of sin and destruction. All the blessings promised and received in baptism may be forfeited, and therefore the Church prays that the child may not only be admitted a member of the body but be made a living member, a member bringing forth good fruit to the praise and glory of God. Then in the first prayer the Lord is besought that the child may be washed and sanctified with the Holy Ghost, "that he being delivered from Thy wrath may be received into the ark of Christ's Church, and being stedfast in faith, joyful through hope, and rooted in charity, may so pass the waves of this troublesome world that finally he may come to the land of everlasting life, there to reign with Thee, world without end." In the prayer immediately before the baptism it is prayed that "this child now to be baptised may receive the fulness of God's grace and ever remain in the number of God's faithful and elect children." This prayer evidently shows that the Church considers that by baptism the child is received into the number of the elect, and that this election does not necessarily imply a certainty of salvation. After the baptism and at the end of the service the Church declares, without making any exception, "It is certain, by God's word, that children which are baptised dying before they commit actual sin are undoubtedly saved."

The Homilies are quite as distinct on the teaching of the Church

as the Liturgy. They begin first with a discourse of the misery of man in a state of nature, proceed next to that of the salvation of mankind by Christ our Saviour only, from sin and death everlasting; from thence they pass to a declaration of a true lively and Christian faith, and after that to good works annexed to faith by which our justification and salvation are to be secured, and in the end descending to the Homily entitled "How dangerous a thing it is to fall from God."

In the second part of the Homily, "Of the knowledge of Holy Scripture," it is declared "that God receiveth the learned and unlearned and casteth away none, but is indifferent unto all." In the Sermon of the Nativity it is declared that "after Christ was come down from heaven and had taken our frail nature upon Him, He made all them that would receive Him truly, and believe His word, good trees and good ground, fruitful and pleasant branches, children of light, citizens of heaven, sheep of His fold, members of His body, heirs of His kingdom, His true friends and brethren, sweet and lively bread, the elect and chosen people of God." And again, "The end of His coming was to save and deliver His people, to fulfil the law for us, to bear witness unto the truth, to teach and preach the words of His Father, to give light unto the world, to call sinners to repentance, to refresh them that labour and be heavy laden, to cast out the prince of this world, to reconcile us in the body of His flesh, to dissolve the works of the devil; last of all to become a propitiation for our sins, and not for our sins only but for the sins of the whole world."

In the Homily "On the danger of falling from God," it is said "If we, which are the chosen vineyard of God, bring not forth good grapes, that is to say good works, that may be delectable and pleasant in His sight, when He looketh for them, when He sendeth His messengers to call upon us for them, but rather bring forth wild grapes, that is to say sour works, unsweet, unsavoury, and unfruitful, then will He pluck away all defence, and suffer grievous plagues of famine, battle, dearth, and death to light upon us. Finally, if these serve not, He will let us lie waste, He will give us over, He will turn away from us, He will dig and delve no more about us, He will let us alone, and suffer us to bring forth even such fruit as we will, to bring forth brambles, briers, and thorns, all naughtiness, all vice, and that so abundantly that they shall clean overgrow us, choke, strangle, and utterly destroy us."

The works of the early Reformers, it must be admitted, show a decided bias in favour of Calvin's views on the doctrine of predestination to life, and to some extent, though but the private opinions of individuals, they help to show what were the generally current ideas on this subject at this period.

Calvin's doctrines of particular redemption and reprobation do not, however, seem to have ever found favour with the English

Reformers. That Calvin was highly esteemed by Cranmer and his associates is well known, and in proof of this the Archbishop wrote to the Genevese reformer expressing his desire "that learned and godly men who excel others in learning and judgment might meet to handle all the heads of ecclesiastical doctrine and agree not only as to the things themselves but also as to words and forms of speaking." He then entreats Calvin that he and Melancthon and Bullinger would deliberate among themselves how such a synod might be assembled. Heylin's statement that Calvin's offer of assistance was refused by Cranmer is, like so many of his statements, unreliable, for it appears from one of Calvin's letters to Cranmer (March 20, 1542) that the offer was made at the instigation of the Archbishop himself. Calvin despatched into England one Nicolas, with letters to the Duke of Somerset and to the King, presenting to the latter a copy of one of his Commentaries, which he had dedicated to the King. Both the King and his Council were much pleased with the present and message, and Cranmer told Nicolas "that Calvin could do nothing more profitable to the Church than to write often to the King."[1]

It is frequently asserted that Calvin objected to the English Liturgy, which is to a certain extent true, but his objection went not so much to the doctrine contained in it, as to the ceremonial, and when he said of it that he saw there *multas tolerabiles ineptias*, he evidently referred to the latter. Martyr and Bucer, two of Calvin's most intimate friends and followers, who had been brought to England by Cranmer for the furtherance of the Reformation in this country, it is well known entirely approved of the doctrinal portions of the Liturgy.

It is sometimes said that the true interpretation of the articles must be sought from the known private sentiments of the Reformers, but such a mode of interpretation does not commend itself to our minds. Surely the Church in requiring subscription to the articles never intended that each subscriber should by that act express an entire conformity with the private sentiments of each compiler, for it is quite possible they held very varying views, and the very object of the general terms of the articles seems to have been to embrace in broad statements many views and variety of sentiments. When the question of the union of all the Protestant Churches of Europe in one ecclesiastical government and one confession of faith was under consideration, a question arose whether, in drawing up a confession of faith, definite or general terms should be adopted, and it is well known that Cranmer, with his usual liberality, pleaded for the greatest latitude, "Let us leave the portal," said he, "as wide as we can, and exclude none whom it is in

[1] Strype's *Mem. of Cranmer*, book iii., chap. 26. Bishop Hooper so valued Calvin as to address him with the appellation of Vir præstantissime, and subscribed himself Tuæ pietatis studiosissimus Jn. Hooperus.

our power to comprehend." This was no doubt the principle he adopted in framing the English articles. The public formularies however may be for a moment glanced at with advantage. There is nothing in the "Ten Articles" of 1536, or "The Institution of a Christian Man" of 1537, known as "The Bishop's Book," or the "Doctrinæ Christianæ Articuli" of 1540, or "The Necessary Erudition of a Christian Man" of 1543, known as "The King's Book," or its Latin translation, the "Pia et Catholica Christiani Hominis Institutio" of 1544, on the subject of predestination. In the "Necessary Erudition" first appeared an article on "Freewill," which declared that "The commandments and threatenings of Almighty God in Scripture, whereby man is called upon and put in remembrance what God would have him to do, most evidently do express and declare that man hath freewill also now after the fall of our first father Adam, as plainly appeareth in these places following: Be not overcome of evil. Neglect not the grace that is in thee. Love not the world, &c. If thou wilt enter into life keep the commandments; which undoubtedly should be said in vain, unless there were some faculty or power left in man whereby he may, by the help and grace of God (if he will receive it when it is offered unto him), understand his commandments, and freely consent and obey unto them: which thing of the Catholic fathers is called freewill, which, if we will describe, we may call it conveniently in all men, a certain power of the will joined with reason, whereby a reasonable creature, without constraint in things of reason, discerneth and willeth good and evil; but it willeth not that good which is acceptable to God, except it be holpen with grace; but that which is ill it willeth of itself; and therefore other men defined freewill in this wise: Freewill is a power of reason and will, by which good is chosen by the assistance of grace, or evil is chosen without the assistance of the same."

We are later on told that the freedom of the will has been so wounded and corrupted by the fall, and men so blinded and weakened, that "they cannot eschew evil except they be illuminated and *made free* by a special grace, that is to say, by a supernatural help and working of the Holy Ghost, which, although the goodness of God, offereth it to all men, yet they only enjoy it, which, by their freewill, do accept and embrace the same." On the other hand, a little further on, we find "It is surely of the grace of God *only* that *first* we be inspired and moved to any good thing; but, to resist temptations, and to persist in goodness and go forward, it is both of the grace of God and of our freewill and endeavour."

In the "Pia et Catholica Institutio" of 1544 freewill is defined to be "Facultas rationis ac voluntatis, qua bonum, assistente gratia, eligitur: malum vero eadem destituente." And preachers are warned, "Nec liberum arbitrium ita predicent ut gratiam Dei

afficiant contumelia; nec gratiam sic efferant ut libero arbitrio locum non relinquant." "Cæterum an singularis aliqua fit per fidem notitia, qua quisquam certe apud se statuere et sibi confirmare possit, esse se de numero prædestinatorum, et eorum qui in Christiana vocatione ad finem usque perseveraturi sunt, non est ut in præsentia dicamus; cum nullam hujusmodi notitiam aut certitudinem vel divinarum literarum testimonio, vel sanctorum patrum scriptis traditam commendatamve habeamus." "Movendi sunt homines, ne damnationem suam Deo ascribant, sed sibi, suoque vitio acceptam referant, qui tot Dei beneficiis ac donis pro suæ voluntatis malitia et libidine ingrati abutuntur," &c., &c.

None of these works of the time of Henry VIII., however, and certainly not "The Necessary Erudition" of 1543, can be taken as determining the doctrine of the English Church. Bishop Tomline, nevertheless, goes so far as to assert that we ought not to put any construction on the articles inconsistent with "The Necessary Erudition" on the ground that both were framed by Cranmer, but it must be remembered that when Cranmer wrote this work he was a decided Romanist, and in it the doctrines of transubstantiation, purgatory, prayers to the dead, and so forth, are distinctly maintained, none of which doctrines were sanctioned in the articles. It may not be generally known that Bishop Bonner so highly valued the "Necessary Erudition," and considered it so in accord with his own sentiments, that he incorporated a considerable part of it into a work which he published in the reign of Queen Mary (1555), in order to promote the reintroduction of the Romish religion into this country.

If the "Necessary Erudition" of 1543 is to be taken as an exposition of Cranmer's views at that time, it is clear that between 1543 and 1547 his views had materially altered; but there is strong reason to suppose that in much contained in the book he was overruled by those associated with him and also by the King. Gardner, in a letter to Cranmer defending the book against his objections to it in 1547, says "After your grace hath for years contentedly held in agreement of that doctrine under our late sovereign Lord, now so suddenly after his death to write to me that his highness *was seduced*, it is, I assure you, a very strange speech." Thus Gardner accuses Cranmer of having abandoned, in 1547, those doctrines which he publicly maintained in 1543.[1] It is most certain that the "Necessary Erudition" cannot be taken as fixing the sense of the articles or even as of any practical value in ascertaining the sentiments of Cranmer at the time the articles were compiled.

In the Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum begun in Henry the Eighth's time, completed in Edward the Sixth's time (1552), and

[1] Strype's *Cranmer*, Append. No. 35.

published in 1571 under the direction of Archbishop Parker,[1] we find the following article:—

De Prædestinatione.

Ad extremum, in ecclesiâ multi feris et dissolutis moribus vivunt, qui cùm re ipsâ curiosi sint, differti luxu, et à Christi Spiritu prorsùs alieni, semper Prædestinationem, et Rejectionem, vel, ut usitatè loquuntur, Reprobationem jactant, ut cùm æterno consilio Deus vel de salute vel de interitu aliquid certi constituerit, inde latebram suis maleficiis, et sceleribus, et omnis generis perversitati quærant. Et cùm pastores dissipatam illorum et flagitiosam vitam coarguunt, in voluntatem Dei criminum suorum culpam conferunt, et hâc defensione profligatas admonitorum reprehensiones existimant; ac ita tandem, duce diabolo, vel in desperationem præsentem abjiciuntur præcipites, vel ad solutam quandam et mollem vitæ securitatem, sine aut pœnitentiâ aut scelerum conscientiâ, dilabuntur. Quæ duo mala disparem naturam, sed finem videntur eundem habere. Nos verò, sacris Scripturis eruditi, talem in hac re doctrinam ponimus, quod diligens et accurata cogitatio de Prædestinatione nostrâ et Electione suscepta[2] sit (de quibus Dei voluntate determinatum fuit antequam mundi fundamenta jacerentur). Hæc itaque diligens et seria, quam diximus, his de rebus cogitatio piorum hominum animos Spiritu Christi afflatos et carnis et membrorum subjectionem præsentantes, et ad cœlestia sursum tendentes, dulcissimâ quâdam et jucundissimâ consolatione permulcet; quoniam Fidem nostram de perpetuâ salute per Christum ad nos perventurâ confirmat, vehementissimas charitatis in Deum flammas accendit, mirabiliter ad gratias agendas exuscitat, ad bona nos opera propinquissimè adducit, et à peccatis longissimè abducit, quoniam à Deo sumus electi, et filii ejus instituti: quæ singularis et eximia conditio summam à nobis salubritatem morum, et excellentissimam virtutis perfectionem, re-

[1] By 3 Ed. VI. (1549) the King was empowered for the space of three years to nominate 32 persons: 16 of the clergy, four whereof to be bishops; 16 of the temporality, four whereof to be learned in the common law of the realm. These thirty-two persons were to peruse and examine the old ecclesiastical laws and to gather order and compile a new body of them. By his letters patent, dated 11th November, 1551, Edward nominated and empowered eight persons to prepare and digest this body of laws to be laid before him and his privy council and the remainder of the 32 which he intended to nominate, in order to the perfecting and ratifying of them according to the tenor of the Act. Archbishop Cranmer was at the head of these eight persons. The doctrinal part of the body of laws thus drawn up consisted of two parts. The first, de summa Trinitate, et Fide Catholica; the second consisting of 22 chapters treats de Hæresibus; both together contain much the same with the Articles. This body of laws failed of being ratified by the premature death of King Edward. They were afterwards published by John Fox, the martyrologist, in 1571, under the direction of Archbishop Parker, and would have had the sanction of the legislature then, had not the over-forwardness of the puritan part of the Commons, who were desirous of assuming everything to themselves, made the Queen prevent it. (See Collier's Eccl. Hist. ii., p. 520, and Sir Symonds Dewes's Jour., 1571.) Though these laws are of no authentative force, yet they give a valuable testimony to the sense and opinions of the compilers of the Articles as almost concurrent with them, and intended to be corroborative of them.

[2] *Sit* is not in the first edition of the *Reformatio*, 1571, it is added by the editor of the second, 1640.

quirit. Denique nobis arrogantiam minuit, ne viribus nostris geri credamus, quæ gratuitâ Dei beneficentiâ et infinitâ bonitate indulgentur. Præterea neminem ex hoc loco purgationem censemus vitiorum suorum afferre posse, quia Deus nihil ullâ in re constituit, nec ad peccata voluntates nostras unquam invitas trudit. Quapropter omnes nobis admonendi sunt, ut in actionibus suscipiendis ad decreta Prædestinationis se non referant, sed universam vitæ suæ rationem ad Dei leges accommodent, cùm et promissiones bonis, et minas malis, in sacris Scripturis generaliter propositas contemplentur. Debemus enim ad Dei cultum viis illis ingredi, et in illâ Dei voluntate commorari, quam in Sacris Scripturis patefactam esse videmus.

The formularies of the reign of Edward VI. throw no light on the subject. In the Shorter Catechism there is, however, the following: "As many as are in this faith stedfast were forechosen, predestinated, and appointed to everlasting life before the world was made, &c." And when the master asks, "Doth then the Spirit alone, and faith (sleep we never so soundly or stand we never so reckless and slothful) so work all things for us, as without any help of our own to carry us idle up to heaven?" the answer is, "I use, master, as you have taught me, to make a difference between the cause and the effect. The first principal and most perfect cause of our justifying and salvation is the goodness and love of God, whereby He chose us for His before He made the world. After that, God granted us to be called by the preaching of the gospel, when the Spirit is poured into us, by whose guiding we be led to settle our trust in God, &c. Finally, to say all in sum, whatsoever is in us, or may be done by us, pure, honest, true, good; that altogether springeth out of this most pleasant root, from this most plentiful fountain, the goodness, love, choice, and unchangeable purpose of God. He is the cause, the rest are the fruit and effect."

The confessions and declarations of the prisoners in Queen Mary's reign, though not possessing the authority of public documents, certainly show that Calvinism prevailed to a considerable extent amongst the early Reformers. Those who then held the doctrine of Calvin were known as "Predestinarians," while those who held views nearer those of Arminius were known as "Free-willers."

The account given by Strype in his Memorials of Cranmer is as follows: "One thing there now fell out which caused some disturbance among the prisoners. Many of them that were under restraint for the profession of the gospel were such as held freewill, tending to the derogation of God's grace, and refused the doctrine of absolute predestination and original sin. They were men of strict and holy lives, but very hot in their opinions and disputatious and unquiet. Divers of them were in the King's Bench,

where Bradford, and many other gospellers were. Many whereof, by their conferences, they gained to their own persuasion. Bradford had much discourse with them. The name of their chief man was Harry Hart, who had writ something in defence of his doctrine. Trew and Abingdon were teachers also among them; Kemp, Gibson, and Chamberlain were others. They ran their notions as high as Pelagius did, and valued no learning; and the writings and authorities of the learned they utterly rejected and despised. Bradford was apprehensive that they might now do great harm in the Church, and therefore out of prison wrote a letter to Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, the three chief heads of the Reformed (though oppressed) Church in England, to take some cognizance of this matter, and to consult with them in remedying it; and with him joined Bishop Ferrar, Rowland Taylor, and John Philpot. This letter, worthy to be read, may be found among the letters of the martyrs and transcribed in the Appendix, No. lxxxiii. Upon this occasion Ridley wrote a treatise of "God's Election and Predestination," and Bradford wrote another upon the same subject, and sent it to those three fathers in Oxford for their approbation; and theirs being obtained, the rest of the eminent divines in and about London were ready to sign it also."[1]

This statement of Strype's is not accurate, for Ridley, in replying to Bradford, evades giving a direct assent to his treatise. He notifies to Bradford the difficulties in the way of conference between the three great reformers on account of their being so "ordered and strictly watched;" and in a subsequent letter implies that Bradford's request had not been acceded to; for he says "And where you say that *if your request* had been heard things (you think) had been in better case than they be. Know you, that considering the matter you mean, I have in Latin drawn out the places of the Scriptures, and upon the same have noted what I can for the time. Sir, in these matters I am so fearful that I dare not speak farther, yea almost none otherwise than the very text doth (as it were) lead me by the hand."[2]

It has been argued by some, from Ridley not having assented in distinct terms to Bradford's views, he did not agree with them, but held views in common with the Freewillers. This is going too far, for it was not unlikely that the leading Reformers, though holding views in common with Bradford, might have considered it either unwise at that time to prouounce on a subject so unfathomable or to approve of the terms in which the doctrine had been propounded in Bradford's treatise. It must be remembered that Bradford was the friend of Ridley and his chaplain. He had

[1] Strype's *Mem. of Cranmer*, book iii., chap. 14.

[2] Ridley's *Life of Ridley*, pp. 550-553. Laurence's Authentic Doctrine respecting the Predestinarian Controversy.

been ordained by Ridley and preferred by him. It is not unlikely, therefore, that he had a pretty correct idea of what views Ridley entertained on the subject, and notwithstanding the ingenious way in which it has been attempted to prove that Ridley repudiated Bradford's views, we must candidly admit that the more powerful presumption is that though Ridley wisely refrained from committing himself and his co-reformers by putting the stamp of his authority on the production of Bradford, yet their views were not very dissimilar.

The martyrs were pretty equally divided in opinion on the subject, and John Trewe, another of the prisoners in the King's Bench, wrote a treatise on the other side of the question.

The real point at issue between these martyrs seems to have been as to the *cause* of election, whether it was in respect of our works, *ex fide et operibus prævisis*, or not. Neither Trewe nor Bradford understood one another's views, and they mutually misrepresented each other. Both were very unguarded and vague in their statements of doctrine. Careless, one of Bradford's followers, in his examination before Dr. Martin, refers to Trewe's belief thus: "Truly I think he (Trewe) doth believe, as your mastership and the rest of the popish clergy do believe of predestination, that we be elected in respect of our good works and so long as we do them and no longer."[1]

[1] The Bishop's Bible, published in 1568 under the direction of Archbishop Parker, with notes made by the translators and revised by the Archbishop, shows pretty clearly the generally received opinions at that time:—

Gen. xii. 1. "*I am the Almighty God, &c.*" "God freely chooseth His, that they should be holy and without hypocrisy before Him."

Gen. xxviii. 15. "*I will not leave thee.*" "God taketh all the charge of His elect, and never forsaketh them."

Exod. vii. 3. "*I will harden Pharaoh's heart.*" "God was no cause of Pharaoh's sin, though He executed this just judgment upon him."

Exod. xxxii. 32. "*Wipe me, I pray Thee, out of Thy book.*" "Out of the number of them that be elect and predestinate to life everlasting."

Exod. xxxii. 33. "*I will put him out of my book that hath sinned against me.*" "I will make it known that he was never any of the elect."

Deut. xxx. 19. "*Therefore choose life.*" "That is to say, show thy love and obedience to God, which is not performed by our own strength, but by God's grace working in His elect."

Rom. ix. 11. "Paul treateth of election and reprobation."

Rom. ix. 11. "*That the purpose of God by election might stand.*" "The will and purpose of God is the cause of the election and reprobation: for His mercy and calling through Christ are the means of salvation, and the withdrawing of His mercy is the cause of damnation."

Rom. xi. 35. "*Either who hath given unto Him first, and he shall be recompensed again.*" "By this the Apostle declareth, that God, by His freewill and election, doth give salvation unto men without any desert of their own."

2 Tim. ii. 19. "*But the strong foundation of God standeth still, &c.*" "He groundeth on God's election and man's faith."

1 Peter i. 2. "*Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father.*" "The free election of God is the efficient cause of our salvation: the material cause is Christ's obedience: our effectual calling is the formal cause: and the final cause is our sanctification."

2 Peter i. 10. "*Give the more diligence to make your calling and election sure.*" "Albeit it be sure in itself, for as much as God cannot change: yet we must confirm it in ourselves by the fruits of the Spirit, knowing that the purpose of God electeth, calleth, sanctifieth, and justifieth us."

We have seen that King James adopted in the early part of his reign strong Calvinist views on predestination and grace, but in his latter days he evidently veered round to more moderate views. In 1624 we find the Calvinists striving to represent their peculiar views as those of the Church of England, and endeavouring to show that the decrees of the Synod of Dort were binding on the English Church on the grouud that representatives of this nation had taken part in its deliberations and had assented to its conclusions. They endeavoured to obtain popular favour by pronouncing the views of Arminius to be Roman, and adopting the terms Papists and Arminians as designations of those who declined to follow the opinions of Calvin. But there was a growing feeling, a gradual reaction in the land, against the tyranny of Geneva. Of its two great upholders at Court one Montague, Bishop of Winchester, had passed away, and the other, Abbot, had lost the favour of the King which he once possessed; moreover, Laud was ascending in power.

In the village of Stamford Rivers, in Essex, certain Jesuits had established themselves, to the horror of the rector of the parish, Richard Montagu, Prebendary of Windsor and Fellow of Eton. Montagu was a man of extensive learning and pugnacious disposition, and he began an attack on those he considered interlopers in his parish. His attack they replied to by sending him a pamphlet with the title "A Gag for the New Gospel." Montagu was not slow in responding, and issued an answer entitled "A New Gag for an Old Goose," in which he showed that many of the doctrines attributed to the Church of England existed merely in the imagination of her opponents or in the fancies of the Puritans, finding no place in the formulas of the Church.

In one part of his work he marshals the Jesuits' position against Protestantism, that God, by His will and inevitable decree, hath ordained from all eternity who shall be damned and who saved, which Montagu says should rather be thus: "That God, by His sole will and absolute decree, hath irrespectively resolved and inevitably decreed some to be saved, some to be damned from all eternity;" and proceeds—"Some Protestants, and no more than some, have considered God, for this effect of His will, in reference to Peter and Judas, thus: that Peter was saved because that God would have him saved absolutely; and resolved to save him necessarily, because He would so, and no further; that Judas was damned as necessarily, because that God, as absolute to decree as omnipotent to effect, did primarily so resolve concerning him, and so determine touching him without respect to anything but His own will; insomuch that Peter could not perish, though he would, nor Judas be saved, do what he could. This is not the doctrine of Protestants; the Lutherans of Germany detest and abhor it; it is the private fancies of some men, I grant: but what are opinions

unto decisions? private opinions unto received and decided doctrines? The Church of England hath not taught it, doth not believe it, hath opposed it. Wisely contenting herself with this 'quousque and limitation.' Article 17: 'We must receive God's promises in such wise as they be generally set forth to us in Holy Scripture;' and not presuming to determine of where, how, wherefore, or whom; secrets reserved to God alone."

Two lecturers or preachers at Ipswich, Yates and Ward, drew out of this reply certain propositions which they asserted savoured of Popery and Arminianism, and prepared these propositions for presentation to Parliament. Montagu sought protection of the King, who gave him leave to appeal to himself and also to print his defence, provided Dr. White, Dean of Carlisle, should approve his doctrine as agreeable to that of the Church of England. When the complaint of Yates and Ward was brought before Parliament it was referred to the Archbishop of Canterbury. Abbot, the archbishop, gave the author a solemn admonition, of which he, however, took little notice, especially as he was openly encouraged by the Bishops of Oxford, Rochester, and St. David.

It was on this occasion that Bishop Hall wrote his "Via Media: the way of Peace in the Five busy Articles,"[1] as a go-between, so to speak, of Calvinism and Arminianism. He thus describes his attempt to heal the disputes which then threatened to disturb the Church. "As one that desired to do all good offices to our dear and common mother," he says, "I set my thoughts on how so dangerous a quarrel might be happily composed, and, finding that mistaking was more guilty of this dissension than misbelieving (since it plainly appeared to me that Mr. Montagu meant to express not Arminius but Bishop Overal, a more moderate and safe author, however he sped in delivery of him), I wrote a little project of pacification, wherein I desired to rectify the judgment of men concerning this misapprehended controversy; showing them the true party in this unseasonable plea; and, because Bishop Overal went a midway betwixt the two opinions, which he held extreme, and must needs therefore somewhat differ from the commonly received tenet in these points, I gathered out of Bishop Overal on the one side, and out of our English divines at Dort on the other, such common propositions concerning these five busy articles as wherein both of them are fully agreed. All which, being put together, seemed unto me to make up so sufficient a body of accorded truth, that all other questions moved hereabouts appeared merely superfluous; and every moderate Christian might find where to rest himself, without hazard of contradiction. These I

[1] The full title is "Via Media. The way of Peace in the five busy articles commonly known by the name Arminius: touching (1) Predestination; (2) The extent of Christ's death; (3) Man's freewill and corruption; (4) The manner of our conversion to God; (5) Perseverance. Wherein is laid forth so fair an accommodation of the different opinions as may content both parts and procure happy accord."

made bold, by the hand of Dr. Young, the worthy Dean of Winchester, to present to his excellent Majesty, together with an humble motion of a peaceable silence to be enjoined to both parts, in those other collateral and needless disquisitions, which, if they might benefit the schools of academical disputants, could not certainly sound well from the pulpits of popular auditories. Those reconciliatory papers fell under the eyes of some great divines on both parts. Mr. Montagu professed that he had seen them, and would subscribe to them very willingly; others that were contrarily minded, both English, Scottish, and French divines, proffered their hands to a no less ready subscription. So as much peace promised to result out of that weak and poor enterprise, had not the confused noise of the misconstructions of those who never saw the work, crying it down for the very name's sake, meeting with the royal edict of a general inhibition, buried it in a secure silence."

The well-meant attempt of Bishop Hall was fated to produce no result, for Montagu, in a more elaborate treatise, defending his original position, increased the wrath of his opponents. This work, entitled "Appello Cæsarem," he dedicated to the King, but before its publication the so-called Solomon of his age was carried to his rest, leaving to his unhappy successor the settlement of the increasing strife. The book was licensed by Dr. White, Dean of Carlisle, with this approbation prefixed: "That there was nothing contained in the same but what was agreeable to the public faith, doctrine, and discipline established in the Church of England."

In his work Montagu distinctly repudiates the decrees of the Synod of Dort. "I have nothing at all," says he, "to do with their conclusions further than they do consent and agree to and with the conclusions and determinations of that Synod of London which established the doctrine of our Church."[1]

Montagu was summoned to the bar of the House of Commons

[1] He thus nobly defends himself against the charge of Arminianism: "I disavow," says he, "the name and title of Arminian. I am not, nor would be accounted willingly, Arminian, Calvinist, or Lutheran (names of division), but a Christian. For my faith was never taught by the doctrines of men. I was not baptised into the belief, or assumed by grace into the family of any of these. I will not pin my belief unto any man's sleeve, carry he his head ever so high: not unto St. Augustine, or any ancient father, *nedum* unto men of lower rank. A Christian I am, and so glory to be; only denominated of Jesus Christ, my Lord and Master, by whom I never was as yet so wronged that I would relinquish willingly that royal title and exchange it for any of His menial servants. And further yet, I do profess that I see no reason why any member of the Church of England —a Church every way so transcendant unto that of Leyden and Geneva—should stoop so low as to denominate himself of any of the most eminent amongst them. Again, for Arminianism, I must and do protest, before God and His angels, *idque in verbo sacerdotis*, the time is yet to come that I ever read word in Arminius. The course of my studies was never addressed to modern epitomizers; but from my first entrance to the study of divinity I balked the ordinary and accustomed by-paths, and betook myself to scripture, the rule of faith, interpreted by antiquity, the best expositor of faith, the applier of that rule; holding it a point of discretion, to draw water, as near as I could, to the well head, and to spare labour in vain in running further off to cisterns. I went to 'enquire,' when doubt was, 'of the days of old,' as God Himself directed me; and hitherto I have not repented me of it."

in 1625, when the House appointed a committee to examine the errors of the "Appello Cæsarem," and thanked the archbishop for his former admonition to the author, whose books they voted to be contrary to the established articles, to tend to the King's dishonour, and to the disturbance of Church and State. They appointed a time for him to answer, and made him enter into a bond to appear again before them under the penalty of £2000,[1] King Charles I. however now interfered and informed the Commons that "what had been spoken in their House against Mr. Montagu was displeasing to him. He hoped one of his chaplains might have as much protection as the servant of an ordinary burgess." The majority of the House seem to have been zealous Calvinists; indeed Neal asserts that 44 of them had made a covenant among themselves to oppose everything that tended towards Pelagianism or semi-Pelagianism.

Montagu's three friends, the bishops, solicited the influence of the Duke of Buckingham, denying the right of Parliament to interfere in a matter touching the doctrine of the Church, but the Duke himself stood in too precarious and critical a position to suffer himself to be embroiled in a question of this nature.

In 1626 a new Parliament was opened and the attack on Montagu's book reinstituted, the matter being referred to a committee called "The Committee of Religion." This committee reported to the House, through Pym, one of the leaders of the Puritan faction, that Montagu's book contained many erroneous opinions, and the House resolved that "Mr. Montagu endeavoured to reconcile England to Rome, and to alienate the King's affections from his well-affected subjects." They prayed "that the said Richard Montagu might be punished according to his demerits, in such exemplary manner as might deter others from attempting so presumptuously to disturb the peace of the Church and State, and that the book aforesaid might be suppressed and burnt." His punishment seems to have been the promotion shortly afterwards to a bishopric.

Several treatises at this time appeared against Montagu from the pens of Dr. Sutcliffe, Dean of Exeter; Dr. Good and Dr. Featly, chaplains to Archbishop Abbot; Messrs. Burton, Yates, Wotton, and Rouse, Provost of Eton, William Prynne, and Bishop Carleton.[2] The last named had been one of the delegates to the Synod of Dort. His work, which was published in 1626, is entitled "Examination of those things wherein the author of the

[1] In the first Parliament of Charles the First a bill was brought in against heresy and false doctrine, and to receive and establish the decrees of the Synod of Dort as part of the doctrine of the Church of England. It did not pass by reason of the dissolution of Parliament.

[2] Dr. Fuller gives the following account of these answers: Dr. Sutcliffe is said to have chid most heartily, Mr. Rouse most honestly, Mr. Burton wrote plainly, Bishop Carleton very piously, Mr. Yates learnedly, and Mr. Wotton most solidly.

late appeal taketh the doctrines of the Pelagians and Arminians to be the doctrines of the Church of England." In it he asserts that up to his time there had been no real difference in doctrinal matters between the Conformists and the Puritans. The main propositions he attacks are 1st, that election and predestination are respective, and 2ndly, that it is possible to fall from grace.

Two conferences were held at York House before the Duke of Buckingham, the Earl of Warwick, and others: the Arminian position being maintained by Dr. Bukeridge, Bishop of Rochester, and Dr. White, Dean of Carlisle; while the Calvinistic position was maintained by Dr. Morton, Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry, and Dr. Preston. In the second conference Montagu took the place of the Bishop of Rochester. Nothing came of the conference, but, the controversy increasing in heat, the King, in 1626, issued a proclamation declaring "his religious care of the peace of this Church and the commonwealth of England; and finding that of late some questions and tenets seem to have been broached in matters of doctrine and tenets of our religion, at first only intended against Papists but which have afterwards, by the sharp and indiscreet handling of some of either party, given much offence to sober and well-grounded readers, His Majesty hath therefore thought fit, by the advice of his reverend bishops, to declare and publish his utter dislike of all those, who, to show the subtlety of their wits, or please their own humours, or vent their own passions, shall adventure to start any new opinions differing from the sound and orthodox grounds of the religion of the Church of England, and also to declare his full and constant resolution, that neither in doctrine nor discipline of the Church, nor in government of the State, he will admit the least innovation. . . . . Wherefore, he doth straitly command all his subjects, especially those who are Churchmen, from henceforth to carry themselves so wisely, warily, and conscionably, that neither by writing, preaching, printing, conferences, or otherwise, they raise, publish, and maintain any other opinions concerning religion, than such as are clearly warranted by the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England; and enjoineth his reverend archbishops and bishops in their several dioceses, speedily to reclaim and repress all such spirits as shall, in the least degree, attempt to violate this bond of peace."

In 1628 the House of Commons again took the matter up, and presented to the King a remonstrance against the Arminians, who, as usual, they linked with the Romanists. "The hearts of your good subjects are perplexed," they said, "when they behold with sorrow a daily growth and spreading of the faction of the Arminians; that being, as your Majesty well knows, but a cunning way to bring in Popery—being Protestants in show, but Jesuits in opinion; which caused your Royal Father, with so much pious wisdom, to endeavour the suppressing of them. And your gracious

Majesty, imitating his most worthy example, hath openly, and by your proclamation, declared your mislike of those persons and of their opinions, who, notwithstanding, are much favoured and advanced, not wanting friends even of the clergy near to your Majesty, namely, Dr. Neile, Bishop of Winchester, and Dr. Laud, Bishop of Bath and Wells, who are justly suspected to be unsound in their opinions that way. And it being now generally held the way to preferment and promotion in the Church, many scholars do bend the course of their studies to maintain those errors, their books and opinions are suffered to be printed and published; and, on the other side, the imprinting such as are written against them, and in defence of the orthodox Church, is hindered and prohibited; and means hath been sought out to depress and discountenance pious and painful and orthodox preachers, and, how conformable soever and peaceable in their disposition they be, yet the preferment of such is opposed, and they are hardly permitted to lecture."[1]

Laud drew up an answer for the King, in which he denies the increase of Popery in the country, and asserts that it is a great reflection upon the King, "as if his Majesty is so ignorant in matters of religious belief, or so indifferent in maintaining them, as that any singular opinion should grow up or any faction prevail in the kingdom without his knowledge; that two eminent prelates attending his person were much wronged in being accused without the least colour of proof produced against them; and that should either these bishops or any others attempt the altering of religion he would quickly animadvert upon them, without staying for the Commons' remonstrance."

Laud was soon afterwards advanced to the see of London, and in 1629 the 39 Articles were published, with the Declaration prefixed written by him. This Declaration is now printed with the Articles, and in it Convocation is declared to be the proper instrument for settling all points of doctrine, and with regard to disputed points shows that all clergymen have signed the articles, by which it is urged that all agree in the true, usual literal sense of the same. It then declares the King's will "that all further curious search be laid aside, and these disputes shut up in God's promises as they be generally set forth in the Holy Scriptures and the general meaning of the Articles of the Church of England according to them. And no man hereafter shall either print, or preach, or draw the Articles aside anyway, but shall submit to it in the plain and full meaning thereof, and shall not put his own sense or comment to be the meaning of the Articles, but shall take it in the literal and grammatical sense."

On the very first day of the new session of Parliament, in 1629, the Arminians were again attacked. The House of Commons seemed to think it their first duty to determine all matters of

[1] Rushworth, vol. i., 621-2.

Theology, and a speech of a Mr. Rouse was particularly well received. In it he said "I desire that we may consider the increase of Arminianism, an error that makes the grace of God lackey it after the will of man, that makes the sheep to keep the shepherd, and makes a mortal seed of an immortal God. An Arminian is the spawn of a Papist, and if there come the warmth of favour upon him, you shall see him turn into one of those frogs that rise out of the bottomless pit." It just shows the spirit of rancorous animosity and ignorance prevalent in the "first assembly in the world." The whole House formed itself into a so-called "Committee of Religion," and the most absurd statements were made, the result being a resolution called "The Vow of the House of Commons"—"We, the Commons in Parliament assembled, do claim, protest, and avow for truth, the sense of the Articles of Religion which were established by Parliament in the 13th year of our late Queen Elizabeth, which, by the public act of the Church of England, and by the general and current expositions of the rulers of our Church, hath been delivered unto us. And we reject the sense of the Jesuits and Arminians, and all others wherein they differ from us."[1]

On the 13th February, 1629, there was a considerable commotion in the Commons on the subject of the increase of Popery, Sir John Eliot making an attack on Bishop Neile and the Lord Treasurer. The Speaker, acting under the King's order, refused to put to the vote a question involving their censure, but he was forcibly held in the chair, amidst great confusion, while the House resolved that "Whosoever shall bring in innovation of religion, or, by favour and countenance seem to extend or introduce Popery or Arminianism, or other opinion disagreeing from the true and orthodox Church, shall be reputed a capital enemy to this kingdom and commonwealth."

The King determined not to submit to the dictation of the Commons, and he accordingly dissolved Parliament and summoned some of the leading members before the Council.

In 1630, Prynne, the lawyer, published his "Anti-Arminianism, or the Church of England's old antithesis to new Arminianism." He attempted to show that the Church of England has ever decidedly opposed the Arminian views and held those of Augustine and Calvin. He supports his views with a vast collection of documentary evidence.

In 1643 the Puritans took it into their heads to revise the 39 Articles. Neal says the design was to render their sense more express and determinate in favour of Calvinism, but after ten weeks in discussing the first fifteen articles they left them very much as they were, the only real changes being the doctrine of

[1] No Parliament in Queen Elizabeth's reign ever established the sense of the articles, nor was there any public act of the Church herself to that effect.

Christ's descent into hell explained away, the article on the Creeds omitted, and in the 11th Article, Christ's obedience said to be imputed to us.

One of the first works published in this country containing a formal attack on Calvinism was issued anonymously in 1633. It was written by Samuel Hoard, Rector of Moreton, and entitled "God's love to mankind, manifested by disproving His absolute decree for their damnation." It is a very able treatise, though the author somewhat misrepresents the view held by the vast majority of Calvinists, and draws conclusions from their premises which they themselves would entirely repudiate. The work called forth answers from three of the leading theologians of the day, Davenant, Twisse, and Amyraut. Davenant published his answer in 1641, entitling it "Animadversions written by the Right Rev. Father in God John Lord Bishop of Salisbury, upon a treatise entitled 'God's love to mankind.'" He points out the unfairness even in the title of Hoard's book. He says "The title of the book justly rejecteth an absolute decree for the damnation of any particular person; for such a decree was never enacted in God's eternal counsel, nor ever published in His revealed word. But for absolute reprobation—if by this word be understood only that preterition, non-election, or negative decree of predestination, which is contradictorily opposed to the decree of election—the one is as absolute as the other; and neither dependeth upon the foreseen difference of men's actions but upon the absolute will of God. For if God from eternity absolutely elected some unto the infallible attainment of grace and glory, we cannot but grant that those who are not comprised within this absolute decree are as absolutely passed by as the other are chosen. The decree of damnation therefore must not be confounded with the decree of negative predestination, which (according to the phrase of the school rather than of the scripture) is usually termed reprobation, by which term of reprobation some understand only the denial of election or predestination. And because the negation is to be measured by the affirmation, unless we be agreed what is meant when we say *Peter was predestinated before the foundations of the world were laid*, we can never rightly judge what is meant when, on the contrary we avouch, *Judas was reprobated before the foundations of the world were laid.* Some others, under the name of reprobation, involve not only the negative decree of preparing such effectual grace as would bring them most certainly unto glory, but an affirmative decree also for the punishing of men eternally in hell fire.

"So far forth as this author to oppose the absolute decree of predestination, and the absolute decree of negative reprobation or non-election, reducing them to the contrary foreseen conditions of good or bad acts in men, he crosseth the received doctrine

of the Church of England. But if he intend only to prove that his adjudication of men unto eternal life or eternal death, and the temporal introduction of men into the kingdom of heaven or casting of men into the torments of hell, are always accompanied with the divine prescience or intuition of contrary acts or qualities in those which are to be saved or condemned, we hold it and acknowledge it a most certain truth. Yet we must here add that predestination and preterition are eternal acts immanant in God the Creator, whereas salvation and damnation are temporal effects terminated unto the creature; and therefore the latter may be suspended upon many conditions, though the former be in God never so absolute."

Davenant urges with force and eloquence the unconditional decree of election; and while he contends that this admits of sufficiency of grace given to all, he maintains that reprobation is of necessity involved in election, his view being thus expressed: "Reprobation is not a denial of sufficient grace but a denial of such special grace as God knoweth would infallibly bring them to glory."

Twisse's reply to Hoard is entitled "The riches of God's love unto the vessels of mercy consistent with His absolute hatred or reprobation of the vessels of wrath." It was published in 1653 and licensed and recommended by Dr. Owen, then Vice-Chancellor of Oxford. In it he took the Supralapsarian view in contradistinction to Davenant, who adopted the Sublapsarian hypothesis.

Amyraut's answer was published in 1640, and entitled "Doctrinæ J. Calvini de absoluto Reprobationis Decreto defensio." In a treatise on predestination in 1634 he had advocated the doctrine of universal redemption, and in this work he endeavours to show that he still adhered to the main position of the Calvinistic scheme.

In 1659 Dr. Peter Heylin published his "Historia Quinqu-Articularis, or a declaration of the judgment of the Western Churches, and more particularly of the Church of England, in the five controverted points reproached in these last times by the name of Arminianism." This work is entirely Arminian, and though ingenious and clever, yet unfortunately many of the author's *facts* are utterly unreliable. His book was answered by Henry Hickman, one of the ministers ejected by the Bartholomew Act of 1662, in a work published in 1673, and entitled "Historia Quinqu-Articularis Exarticulata: or animadversions on Dr. Heylin's Quinquarticular History." The author deals with Heylin's work paragraph by paragraph, and in a searching manner exposes its many weaknesses and blemishes. From the Calvinist's point of view the work is valuable, and, in fact, where known, is highly prized. Still it had nothing like the popularity of Heylin's book.

We cannot pass without notice the masterly dissertation on the 17th Article contained in Bishop Burnet's "Exposition of the Thirty-

nine Articles." He gives a concise and profoundly accurate statement of the position of the respective parties. Dr. Burnet had a clearer insight into the true differences between the parties than any writer who had preceded him, and so impartial was he that were it not for an intimation in his preface it would have been impossible to say with any degree of certainty what views he personally entertained.

The subject of predestination was the rock on which the friendship and union of Wesley and Whitefield split. The latter, as is well known, embraced Calvinistic doctrines while the former adopted the Arminian, and for some years edited "The Arminian Magazine." Whitefield not only believed in the doctrine of reprobation but considered it criminal in him to disguise or modify his opinion on so vital and essential a point of Christian faith, either in deference or in accommodation to any living being. Wesley himself wrote a tract or two on predestination, but a sermon of his on the subject is deemed more than anything else to have caused the irreparable breach between these two remarkable men.

The Wesleyan Methodists hold the doctrines of election, predestination and grace, as the same were held by Arminius, but they, equally with their great leader Wesley, have universally rejected the Pelagianism which has infected so many of Arminius's followers. They have always stood forth strenuously in support of the great catholic doctrines of the atonement, of original sin, and of grace.[1]

One of Wesley's principal opponents was Toplady, a Supralapsarian. In 1769 he brought out his work "The Church of England vindicated from the charge of Arminius and the case of Arminian subscription particularly considered." This he followed in 1774 by his "Historic proof of the Doctrinal Calvinism of the Church of England," a work highly esteemed by Calvinists. Though an able writer he was thoroughly one-sided, and his language so extravagant as to fail to impress one with the soundness of his conclusions.

On the other side appeared Dr. Winchester's "Dissertation on the 17th Article; wherein the sentiments of the compilers and other contemporary Reformers on the subject of the Divine decrees are fully deduced from their own writings." This tract, for it was little more, was published in 1773, and has been admitted by Calvinists to be sensible and temperate.[2]

In 1802 Dr. Kipling, Dean of Peterborough and Deputy Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, published his work: "The Articles of the Church of England proved not to

[1] See the remarkable and powerful sermon of Wesley on the subject of predestination which Mr. Southey, in his Life of Wesley, gives as being the most eloquent and impassioned passage in all Wesley's sermons.

[2] Republished in "The Churchman's Remembrancer," vol. i., Lond., 1807.

be Calvinistic." It was compiled chiefly as a stand against Overton's "True Churchman ascertained."[1] He holds that "by those whom God hath chosen in Christ" the framers of the articles meant every one duly baptised in the Christian faith.

In the same year appeared a pamphlet of 102 pages by the Rev. Ed. Pearson, B.D., Rector of Rempstone, entitled "Remarks on the controversy subsisting or supposed to subsist between the Arminian and Calvinistic members of the Church of England in a letter to the Rev. John Overton, A.B., author of the 'True Churchman ascertained.'" The view the author takes is that Calvinism even in a moderate sense was not intended to be established by articles, but at the same time he did not think it was intended to be altogether excluded. He identifies Calvinism with Puritanism.

Two years later Dr. Richard Laurence, then Professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford and afterwards Archbishop of Cashel, took as the subject for his Bampton Lectures "An attempt to illustrate those Articles of the Church of England which the Calvinists improperly consider as Calvinistic." These lectures have been republished several times, and are a valuable contribution to the controversy. The questions are treated in a scholarly manner, and much original research is displayed throughout, but unfortunately the author has taken a rather one-sided view and occasionally mistaken the teaching of the Schoolmen. He follows some of them far too closely on the subjects of original sin, freewill, and predestination, and adopts a mode of expression which unhappily has too much of a Pelagian tendency. The method he adopts is to trace the articles usually controverted up to their genuine sources, ascertaining the precise objects which the compilers had in view, compare them with the peculiar opinions of their times, and endeavour thus to determine their true meaning with greater certainty. It is somewhat doubtful, however,

[1] Overton, though a Calvinist, makes some candid admissions. He acknowledges that the precise theological system of Calvin, in all its parts and to its full extent, was not intended to be established by the Articles. "To say the least, our established forms do not teach directly several doctrines which are contained in Calvin's Institutions." Amongst other things they are silent on the subject of absolute reprobation. "The authors of these forms," says he, "unquestionably built upon the same foundation with this celebrated Reformer, but they have not carried the superstructure to the same heights. They were aware of the extremes to which some had proceeded on these subjects and of the liability of the doctrines of grace to abuse, and wished therefore to express themselves with moderation and caution. They were aware of the inability of the human understanding to comprehend the whole of the Divine plan of procedure towards His creatures, and, of course, of the difficulties attending the subject when pursued beyond a certain limit. They wished, therefore, in framing a standing public confession, to decide no further upon these deep points than they believed the decision of importance, and for which they had the most express and certain warrant of Scripture. They knew that on this subject especially

'Est modus in rebus, sunt certi denique fines,
Quos ultra citraque nequit consistere rectum,'

or, to adopt the more lofty language of Inspiration, they knew in respect to the Divine procedure in these instances, 'that clouds and darkness are round about Him, but that righteousness and judgment are the habitation of His throne.'"—*True Churchman Ascertained*, p. 93.

whether the important question of the meaning of the articles can be accurately ascertained by an inquiry into the character, connexions, and sentiments of the compilers such as is here made by Dr. Laurence.

In 1811 appeared the work of Dr. Tomline, Bishop of Lincoln: "The Refutation of Calvinism," looked upon by Arminians as unanswerable. The author depends too much upon men like Peter Heylin for his facts; he is scarcely sound on the subject of the 10th Article, and far too ready to draw inferences from the writings of Calvinists, and then refute these inferences without touching the ground from which these inferences were drawn. An example of his dependence on Heylin is shown in his quotation from him of the Articles of the Synod of Dort. The 1st Article, as quoted, is, "God by an absolute decree hath elected to salvation a *very small* number of men without any regard to their faith or obedience whatsoever, and excluded from saving grace all the rest of mankind and appointed them by the same decree . . . . to eternal damnation, without any regard to their infidelity or impenitency." This is a most perverted and distorted rendering of what was decreed at Dort. And as only seven years before Bishop Tomline published his work, in 1804, had been issued from the Clarendon Press the Canons themselves in the "Sylloge Confessionum," this carelessness on his part is all the less excusable. A large portion of the work is taken up with quotations from the Fathers, almost all with the object of showing they held "Freewill," but as the author does not explain the sense in which the term is used the greater part of the volume is practically valueless. In the days when party spirit on the subject ran high, and freedom of expression and abuse mostly occupied the place of dispassionate argument, the book was popular. In fact it is written in a popular style, appealing rather to the heart than the head, a book more useful for the confirmation of those already convinced than convincing to those in opposition.

The Rev. Thomas Scott attempted to answer this work, in his "Remarks on the Refutation of Calvinism," which is a tedious performance. The Bishop of Lincoln and the Commentator so thoroughly misunderstood one another, and the views of the party they opposed, that it is positively painful to have to wade through their writings. Mr. Scott, however, brings out well the nature of the preventing grace of God, and shows, in accordance with the Augustinian doctrine, how this must first incline the will and bestow the disposition to that which is spiritually good before the Divine influence can co-operate with the human will in the progressive work of sanctification. Bishop Tomline had maintained in rather general terms and not with the precision of a skilled theologian that God and man co-operate as distinct and independent agents, the grace of the one concurring with the

natural disposition and freewill of the other, and each contributing its respective share in the work of salvation: a position distinctly having an Arminian tendency. In support of his view he had cited the words of the Latin copy of the articles, "*dum volumus*," "*while* we will," which, he considered, seem to show that the grace of God and the will of man act together at the same moment. To this Mr. Scott replies by quoting the preceding part of the sentence in the 10th Article: "Gratiâ quæ per Christum est nos *præveniente* ut *velimus*, et co-operante, dum volumus;" which shows clearly that the co-operation is confined to the latter clause, and follows *velimus*. Tomline's Refutation has also been replied to by Dr. Edward Williams in his "Defence of Modern Calvinism."

The Bampton Lectures of Bishop Mant, in 1812, contain an attack on Calvinism. One lecture is entitled "Calvinistic Predestination," and another "The Inconsistency of Calvinism with the Divine Attributes." The Calvinism he attacks is that of Toplady, Sir Richard Hill, and Dr. Hawker, from whose works he makes copious quotations. His treatment of the subject is unjust in making Calvinists in general responsible not only for the intemperate language and doubtful positions of the three controversialists he cites, but also for all the conceivable consequences of their opinions, consequences which, to a man, they would probably entirely repudiate. The author is also guilty of attributing to the mere holding of any one Calvinistic tenet, all the gross errors and extravagances of Calvinists of every age and nation. Throughout his lectures he confounds together men and works of the most distinct and even opposite nature and character.

We must pass by the works of Copleston, Whately, Graves, Watson, Sumner, and others to the year 1836, in which appeared Mr. Stanley Faber's "Primitive Doctrine of Election." This able treatise Principal Cunningham styles "a mass of confusion," a work which can "produce only error and misapprehension in the minds of those who are unacquainted with some of the more thorough and searching expositions of these important and difficult subjects." Dr. Cunningham's opinion of the author is little better than of the book, for he says "he has not penetrated beneath the surface. He has been entirely carried away by slight and superficial differences, while he has wholly failed to perceive intrinsic and substantial resemblances." From a perusal of a vast load of literature on the subject we have no hesitation in saying that with one single exception (and the single exception is a small essay on election, by Mr. Edward Fry, published in 1864) this is by far the ablest treatise which has yet appeared upon the subject. We cannot but regard Dr. Cunningham's remarks as a piece of unfair and malignant criticism unworthy the abilities of the gifted critic.

Mr. Faber refutes, with singular felicity, the three different

theories of Calvinism, Arminianism, and Nationalism, or the system advocated by Locke and Dr. John Taylor, placing in opposition to them what he calls Ecclesiastical Individualism, meaning thereby an election of individuals to the privileges of the visible Church and to the enjoyment of means of grace. His scheme in point of causation agrees with Calvinism and Nationalism, and resolves the cause of election into the good pleasure of God. In point of Ideality it agrees with Nationalism in representing election as a choice of men only to the communion of the Visible Church and to the enjoyment of the means of grace; differing however in that individuals instead of nations are made the subjects of it. He considers Arminianism the most erroneous of the systems: having departed from the true doctrine of the Church, both in causality and ideality, whereas Calvinism and Nationalism are both right, or nearly so, in point of causality, and both wrong in point of ideality.

Dr. Mozley's "Treatise on the Augustinian Doctrine of Predestination" is a work of great ability and learning. The author takes a sound and churchmanlike view of the topics he touches, but his volume is confined to the Predestinarian doctrine of Augustine. He sees no substantial difference between this doctrine and that of the Thomists and Calvinists. He considers that those who suppose that Augustine differs from Calvin in his doctrine of predestination do not really know the doctrine which Augustine held and suppose it to be different from what it was. They suppose it to be a qualified doctrine of predestination to privileges and means of grace; or they have some general idea that Augustine did not hold such a doctrine as Calvin held—an assumption which settles, to begin with, the question for them. Even the cautions and checks which Calvin appends to the doctrine Dr. Mozley points out are substantially the same as we find appended to the doctrine of Augustine and the Augustinian Schoolmen. While seemingly adopting the Calvinistic scheme the author stops short of committing himself to it.

In Principal Cunningham's "The Reformers and the Theology of the Reformation," published in 1862, there is a powerful essay in favour of Calvinism, and in his "Historical Theology," published in 1864, he treats at large of the differences between the Calvinists and the Arminians. He takes the view that the one fundamental principle of Calvinism, the admission or denial of which constitutes the real line of demarcation between Calvinists and Anti-Calvinists, is the doctrine of predestination, *in the more limited sense of the word*, or of election, as descriptive of the substance of the teaching of Scripture with regard to what God decreed or purposed from eternity to do, and does or effects in time, for the salvation of those who are saved; and that every man ought to be held by others, and ought to acknowledge him-

self to be a Calvinist who believes that God from eternity chose some men, certain persons of the human race, absolutely and unconditionally to salvation through Christ, and that He accomplishes this purpose or executes this decree in time, by effecting and securing the salvation of these men, in accordance with the provisions of the covenant of grace.

This we cannot admit. The doctrine as thus expressed is not Calvinistic, it is nearer Augustinian. Reprobation cannot be separated from the doctrine of Calvin, and we have his own admission of the truth of this. There are thousands who would be willing to acknowledge the doctrine of predestination, as thus expressed, who would at the same time utterly reject the scheme of Calvin and disown the companionship of his followers.

It is true there is no statement of reprobation in the Scottish Confession of 1560, or in the Second Helvetic of 1566, which was approved of by almost all the Reformed Churches, but it is begging the question to bring this fact in support of his argument, as Dr. Cunningham does, alleging that they are Calvinistic. Surely a Calvinist, strictly speaking, must admit the Canons of the Synod of Dort; and does this not enunciate the doctrine of reprobation in most distinct terms? It would seem fairer not to take election as the peculiar doctrine of Calvinists, this being a doctrine accepted by all Christians, Arminians included, but rather reprobation, this being by no means so widely received.

Dr. Cunningham seems to imagine that a man who is not an Arminian must be a Calvinist, and if not a Calvinist must be an Arminian, and he considered it absurd of Dr. Whately to deny that he was either. The whole of the two works we are considering, as is usual with Calvinists, display an utter ignorance of the views of the Arminians, for we cannot suppose for one moment that the author would wilfully attribute to them what they have invariably repudiated. His position that a man who rejects the Socinian denial of the Divine foreknowledge must be either an Arminian or a Calvinist, or rather must be an Arminian, if he refuses to admit the truth of Calvinism, is simply absurd. He assumes with great confidence the point he proposed to prove, and so irresistible are his arguments that one admitting their validity would by consistency be forced to the conclusion that every piece of furniture not a table must be a sofa!

He asserts that the strength of Calvinism lies in the mass of direct, positive, and, as he believes, unanswerable proofs that can be produced from Scripture and reason, confirmed by much that is suggested by experience and the history of the human race, to establish its fundamental principles of the preordination of whatsoever comes to pass, and the real and effectual election of some men to eternal life. The author, however, makes scarcely any reference whatever to Scripture, and attempts to support his whole

scheme mainly by a refutation of Arminianism. This is quite consistent with the general views to which we have already referred, the author evidently considering that the best proof of the truth of Calvinism must of necessity be the annihilation of the positions usually maintained by the Arminians.

Chapter I.

PREDESTINATION AND FOREKNOWLEDGE.

No one denies that Predestination in some sense is taught in Holy Scripture, and the real question is what doctrine is enunciated therein.

The word rendered 'predestinate' in the Authorized Version is the Greek verb προορίζειν, to 'determine beforehand,' to 'prescribe,' to 'limit,' to 'pre-appoint.'[1] It is used in Rom. viii. 29, 30; Eph. i. 5--11; and Acts iv. 28. It properly signifies to resolve beforehand within one's self what to do, and before the thing resolved on is actually effected to appoint it to some certain use, and direct it to some determinate end. The Hebrew verb *Habhdel*, has much the same signification. The word 'predestinate' is not used in the Revised Version, the word there employed being invariably 'fore-ordain.' In the Authorized Version a distinction was made between Predestination and Fore-ordainment; the operation of the former being confined to the Elect, while under the operation of the latter, the Non-elect were also included.[2] This distinction has not been preserved in the Revised Version.

Predestination may be regarded in a general sense as that Eternal, wise, and immutable, decree of God whereby He did from eternity determine and ordain to create, dispose of, and direct to some particular end, every person and thing to which He has given—or is yet to give—being, and to make the whole creation subservient to and declarative of His glory. Of this decree, actual providence is the executive. Most of the Fathers make use of the word Predestination as it refers to angels and men, whether good or evil, and by them it is usually looked upon as of two species, the one to life and glory which is by pre-eminence called Predestination, the other to eternal death and ignominy. The former is revealed in *Election*, the latter seen in *Reprobation*.

In gathering any great doctrine from Holy Scripture, we must be careful how we attach a meaning to one portion which may be in antagonism to, or inconsistent with, any other portion. One of the most serious objections to Calvinistic and Arminian views of

[1] To which agrees προτιθέναι, to 'propose,' or 'purpose' (Rom. i. 13; Eph. i. 9), and προτάττειν, to 'pre-ordain' (Acts xvii. 26); προετοιμάζειν, to 'prepare' (Rom. ix. 23; 1 Cor. ii. 9),—from which the Ancients for the sake of teaching formed the word προορισμόν, 'predestination,' to which answers πρόθεσις τῆς καρδίας, 'purpose of heart' (Acts xi. 23).—*Theses iv. of Gomarus.*

[2] The same distinction is made in the Westminster Confession, c. iii., § 3, and Calvinists in general have held that there is an important difference between the way and manner in which the decree of election bears on the condition and fate of those who are saved, and the way and manner in which the decree of reprobation operates upon the condition of those who perish, a distinction they consider in some vague way to be marked by the use of the word 'predestinate' in the one case, and of 'pre-ordain' in the other.

Predestination is that the systems are grounded on imperfect and partial views of Revelation, and rest on doubtful interpretations of detached passages of Scripture. The truth of any doctrine cannot be gleaned in this manner from Holy Writ. The Word is *one*, the Revelation is *one*, and the only safe course is to take the Word and Revelation as one, and see that our interpretation of any part is in harmony with, or at least not inconsistent with any other part; for the all-wise God cannot be guilty of inconsistency. The Divine purposes, as revealed in Holy Scripture, have occasioned much controversy, a large body advocating the existence, the eternity, and unchangeableness of Divine Decrees, yet differing among themselves as to their extent; some regarding such decrees as embracing every event that transpires, others limiting the operation of such decrees to what is good only. On the other hand, there are not a few who, viewing the doctrine of Divine Decrees as opposed to freedom in God, and irreconcilable with freedom in the creature, deny the existence of any Decrees at all.

The denial of the Decrees of God, however, involves most serious consequences. How can we suppose that the Almighty performs in time that which He has not in Eternity designed to effect? The perfections of the Deity are manifest in His works. These are evidence of heavenly wisdom and design, and no contemplative mind, looking up from nature to nature's God, can come to any other conclusion than that all His plans must have been conceived, considered, and settled in Eternity. A Being of such infinite understanding would not act but according to a purpose—a fixed and determinate design, and revelation bears this out most conclusively. "Known unto God are all His works from the beginning of the World."[1]

Either the Almighty had a fixed and determinate design and purpose or He had not—there is no middle course. He either acted in the great work of Creation and Redemption without forethought and design, or He determined to act in the manner in which He has acted. It would be charging folly upon the Most High to say He acted without design, for this is equivalent to saying He acted without wisdom, there being no stronger evidence of lack of wisdom than action without design and void of purpose.

We may then conclude that the Almighty acts not without design, that He has a purpose, and that all His works and operations in time are the result of determinations or decrees formed before the foundation of the world.

It is clear that God could never give a promise to His people, or predict judgment upon them, if He had formed no purpose to that effect. "Whatsoever God doeth it shall be for ever; nothing can be put to it, nor anything taken from it,"[2] for "He is in one

[1] Acts xv., 18. [2] Eccles. iii. 14.

mind, and who can turn Him? and what His soul desireth, even that He doeth, for He performeth the thing that is appointed for me"; "God doeth it that men may fear before Him."[1]

"This is the purpose that is purposed upon the whole earth, and this is the hand that is stretched out upon all the nations. For the Lord of hosts hath purposed, and who shall disannul it? and His hand is stretched out, and who shall turn it back?"[2]

The Decrees of God are sometimes referred to as His *counsels.* "The counsel of the Lord standeth for ever, and the thoughts of His heart to all generations. There are many devices in a man's heart; nevertheless the counsel of the Lord that shall stand."[3] "My counsel shall stand and I will do all My pleasure."[4]

So also they are referred to as "His *purpose.*"[5] "Who hath saved us and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to His own purpose and grace which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world begun."[6] "That the purpose of God according to election might stand."[7] So St. Paul writes to the Thessalonians as those "appointed to obtain salvation by Jesus Christ, being from the beginning chosen in Him to salvation, through sanctification of the Spirit, and belief of the truth."[8]

The Decrees of God are sovereign in the true and scriptural sense. God does according to His will, being under no obligation to form and execute any plan whatever. The existence of the world and of man is the result of a Divine choice; it is the result of Infinite wisdom. All creatures exist through the pleasure of God, are dependent on Him, and cannot exist independently of Him. Real glory to Himself, and the highest good to the creature —glory and good, not otherwise attainable,—is the reason of the Divine choice, whether it respects the existence or the salvation of man. The Almighty wills nothing without the best reason, which reason, however, may be wholly or partially unknown to us, yet He has always good in view, and good always is a main element in the Divine choice or determination. "In the days of eternity," says Bellamy,[9] "long before the foundation of this world, this system now in existence, and this plan which now takes place, and all other possible systems, and all other possible plans, more in number, perhaps, than the very sands of the sea shore, all equally lay open to the Divine view, and one was as easy to Almightiness as another. He had His choice. He has none to please but Himself. Besides Him there was no being. He had a perfectly good taste, and nothing to bias His judgment, and was infinite in wisdom. This He chose, and this of all possible systems the best, infinite Wisdom and perfect Rectitude being judges."

[1] Job xxiii. 13, 14; Eccles. iii. 14.
[2] Isa. xiv. 26, 27.
[3] Psl. xxxiii. 11; Prov. xix. 21.
[4] Isa. xlvi. 10.
[5] Rom. viii. 28.
[6] 2 Tim. i. 9.
[7] Rom. ix. 11.
[8] 1 Thess. v. 9; 2 Thess. ii. 13.
[9] "On the wisdom of God in permission of sin," p. 85.

The Decrees of God are founded upon His foreknowledge. Some have vainly imagined that the Divine foreknowledge was entirely founded upon the Divine decrees; but this position is untenable and leads to gross error. It is true there are certain events which never could have taken place had not God pre-appointed them, and therefore could not have been foreknown unless so appointed. For instance, it is obvious God could not have foreseen the sacrifice and death of Christ—the Redemption of man, and the calling into being of the Church, had he not pre-determined upon them. So God's foreknowledge of the creation of the world and the creation of man must have depended upon His own determinate purpose to put forth his creative power with these objects; and to this extent the Divine Prescience or foreknowledge may be said to be founded on the Divine Decrees, but the expression is not very safe, and must be strictly confined to the extent of God's *own* operations.[1] We must remember that to the all-comprehending mind of the Infinite, the appointment and prescience of things are simultaneous. Priority of purpose and knowledge is only ascribed to God in order that the subject may be so far as possible adapted to our weakness, for in the Divine mind there is no succession. Whatever exists must exist coetaneously and coeternally with all other things which exist in it. God does not exist in time, but in *eternity*, and therefore there is no room for the ideas *before* and *after* in reference to Him. Succession of events cannot make any difference to an Infinite Being. With Him is no "variableness, or any shadow of turning." Whatever is intended by foreknowledge or decrees, all is simultaneous or absolutely coexistent. St. Paul recognizes this truth when he says: "Whom He did foreknow He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son."[2] The predestination is not spoken of as following the foreknowledge any more than the foreknowledge is spoken of as following the predestination.

It must be remembered, too, that God knows all things in a way congruous to His nature and perfections, and not as men have knowledge. He knows all things at once with one comprehensive view—He sees all things with one infinite glance—He grasps the universe and sees the whole existence of His creatures, with all their changes, motions, and actions; not only through all

[1] Those who contend that the liberty of action is subject to an absolute decree, erroneously conclude that the decree of God is the cause of His foreknowledge, and antecedent in order of time. If we must apply to God a phraseology borrowed from our own habits and understanding, that His decrees should have been the consequence of His foreknowledge seems more agreeable to reason, as well as to Scripture, and to the nature of God Himself, who, as we have just proved, decreed everything according to His infinite wisdom, by virtue of His foreknowledge."—MILTON, *Christian Doctrine*, p. 40.

Possibilities must have been seen before purposes were formed about the realization of any of them, assuming any such condition as succession. Indeed, such purpose seems to consist in selecting some possibilities from among others to be realized by future acts of will.

[2] Rom. viii. 29.

time, but from eternity to eternity, comprehending all with one inconceivable unbounded thought. He sees at one view all the vicissitudes and variations of every object; the countless successive generations of men, all their interests—intellectual, moral, and social; perceiving the causes, effects, relations, and changes of all things, with an intuitive prospect. His knowledge is always the same—being perfect, it can neither be increased or diminished, or in any way varied. His knowledge is eternal, having known all things He now knows, or ever will, knowing from before the foundations of the world. Of this Divine knowledge we can have no clear or distinct idea; it is so far removed from our imperfect way of knowledge; all things which are to us past, present, and to come, are always exposed to His all-penetrating eye. "Known unto God are all His works from the beginning of the world."[1]

He is not ignorant of the smallest things. He feeds the fowls of the air; He preserves them so that not a sparrow falls to the ground but with His permission.[2] He clothes the lilies of the field;[3] the very hairs of our head are all numbered.[4] He tells His people's wanderings, and puts all their tears into His bottle.[5] He telleth the number of the stars, calling them all by their names.[6] He knows all things, good and evil; He is Himself the author of all good; His eyes are upon all the ways of men, neither is there iniquity hid from His eyes.[7] "O Lord, thou hast searched and known me; Thou understandest my thoughts afar off; Thou hast beset me behind and before," and, it is added, "such knowledge is too wonderful for me: it is high, I cannot attain unto it!"

He knows all things, necessary, contingent, and free, with the causes, nature, manner, and circumstances of all things—past, present, and future. Nothing can be hid from Him whose eyes are in every place; nothing can be obscure to Him who is everywhere—uncertain to Him who sees all things as they are—or unknown to Him who sees from eternity to eternity.

Various ideas have been entertained as to the manner of God's Prescience. The principal views may be divided into six. The Fathers, generally, and many of the Schoolmen account for it from the presence of all things in eternity, though they differ widely as to how they were so present. Several of the ancient philosophers and others of the Schoolmen refer to it the Ideas of all events in the Divine understanding. The Calvinists, generally, and the Dominicans say, God sees all things in His Decree, precisely determining what shall come to pass, thus entirely founding prescience upon the Decree. These, however, differ among themselves as to whether there is a physical pre-determination of all the motives of the creature or not. The Jesuits and the Pelagians refer it to the knowledge of what the free agents would do if

[1] Acts xv. 18. [2] Matt. vi. 26, x. 29. [3] Matt. vi. 28. [4] Matt. x. 30. [5] Psl. lvi. 8. [6] Psl. cxlvii. 4. [7] Jer. xvi. 17.

placed in such and such circumstances which God has fixed in His purpose; founding the decree upon prescience. Those who hold a modified form of Calvinism believe that God has, in a strict sense, pre-ordained or decreed some events which He sees in His decree, but has left others wholly to the liberty of the creature, purposing to permit them freely to choose, so freely as in no way to interfere with or interrupt their highest freedom, which events, they say, He sees in His own permission, and in the nature, inclination, and circumstances of the agent; and so make neither the Decree of these things prior (even in reason and nature) to His Prescience, nor Prescience to the Decree. Lastly, there are those who rest in the infinitude and absolute perfection of the Divine knowledge and understanding with the certain truth of the event.[1]

It has been urged that God cannot know future contingencies, but this idea is not to be entertained. Cicero's reasoning on this head is well summed up by St. Augustine in his *De civitate Dei* (lib. v. c. 9) thus: If there is freewill, all things do not happen according to fate; if all things do not happen according to fate, there is not a certain order of causes; and if there is not a certain order of causes, neither is there a certain order of things foreknown by God,—for things cannot come to pass except they are preceded by efficient causes,—but, if there is no fixed and certain order of causes foreknown by God, all things cannot be said to happen according as He foreknew that they would happen; and further, if it is not true that all things happen just as they have been foreknown by Him, there is not, says he, in God any foreknowledge of future events.

But it does not follow that because there is a certain order of all causes, therefore nothing depends on the free exercise of the human will, for this itself is included in that order of causes which is certain to God, and is embraced by His foreknowledge; and He who foreknew all the causes of things would certainly among these causes not have been ignorant of our wills. "How then," asks St. Augustine, "does an order of causes which is certain to the foreknowledge of God necessitate that there should be nothing which is dependent on our wills, when our wills themselves have a very important place in the order of causes?"

The assertion that God does not know future contingencies is really a denial of His Prescience, for every free action ever done was, before it was effected, a *future contingency*, and every free action which ever will be wrought to the end of time is now and from the beginning has been a future contingency. A thing is contingent which may or may not be—a contingent action is that which a free agent may or may not do. What is so contingent as to be also future is called a *future contingency*. It is contingent in respect of the manner in which it will be produced, not neces-

[1] Millar: The Omniscience of God Stated and Considered, p. 34.

sarily, but freely (the thing may or may not be done,—the agent having a power to act or not); it is future in regard to the certainty of the event that it will be done. God knows the agent may do either and which it will do since both cannot be done, so that all free actions are, and may be called contingent. In every case where the agent must do or not, one of these two is future; but if he is free he may choose which he will do, and the one which he will chose to do is now a future contingency.

Take the example of Adam's fall. It was certain that Adam must either stand or not. It was certain he could not possibly do both. It was certain that he would have liberty to choose which he would, therefore it is evident that one of these was a future contingency, namely, one of them was necessarily future, but which it would be, which he would choose, was left to himself. He had strength given him of God sufficient to resist the temptation held out to him. The will of God had been revealed to him, and it was his duty to have submitted his free will in obedience to and in dependency on his Creator. The fall was not caused or necessitated by God, though permitted, and, of course, foreseen. It was permitted because God would not set aside and destroy the free will of His creature. He looked for a reasonable service and free obedience, and not the involuntary action of a mere machine; as Tertullian puts it, "He laid a kind of restraint upon His foreknowledge and over-ruling power by which He might have so interposed that man should not by abusing his free will have fallen into sin: for if He had so interposed, He had taken away the freedom of will which in wisdom and goodness He had conferred upon him." No necessity rested on the Agent—it was never true that he must sin, never true that he could not abstain from sinning; never true that he could not stand; never true that he was under any necessity which caused his fall. All that was true was that he would sin freely. It was true when he was created that he *might* either stand or fall, *might* sin or not, and it was at the same time true that he *would* sin freely. The event was itself contingent, might have been or not; there was nothing in the nature of the thing that made it necessary. He was free to sin or not, and knew that he was. He freely chose, freely ate, knowing he might have abstained. He never attempted to excuse himself by asserting that he could not have helped it, which it is clear he would have done, could he with truth have urged such an excuse.

It is true that as all events are directed and overruled by the Almighty so as to be subservient to His own eternal purpose, an action cannot be said to be contingent in the sense of *uncertain* to Him, for no events are or can be to God contingent in this sense. He who knows all the things that ever will be done, knows certainly and infallibly, not only the things themselves, but the causes of them, and the way and manner in which they

will be produced, whether necessarily, contingently, or freely. But the certain knowledge of the Almighty of what will be done freely, neither abridges the liberty of the agent, nor changes the contingency of the event. It was equally certain to God, for instance, that Adam might or might not sin, and yet would sin freely.

But it is objected that infallible foreknowledge such as this in the Almighty, though it may not make, yet it presupposes an equal necessity with the absolute decree. The objection, however, is not tenable, for an absolute decree to cause anything infers a causal necessity which cannot possibly be resisted; but that which supposes its object cannot possibly infer any such thing. No *knowledge*, however infallible, has any influence at all upon its object, nor does it make it either more or less certain, fixed, or necessary, than it would have been if it had not been known or foreknown. The infallibility of the foreknowledge arises from the most perfect, true, and full apprehension of the object. What God foreknows will infallibly be—but it will infallibly be as He foreknows, it will be, namely, necessary, contingent, or free.

Freedom includes a power to choose and act or not; but the foreknown choice of the agent to do this and not that, does not take away that power any more than the knowledge of his present free choice to do this takes away the power to choose that, if he had pleased.

The question has been raised whether any action ought to be reputed *free* which was ever *certain*. The question might be put in this way—whether any action which the Almighty certainly foreknows that a free agent will freely do, ought to be regarded as free. We must reply in the affirmative, for the certain foreknowledge of what free agents will do freely, supposes that the agents will be free, and will act freely; and since freedom implies a power to act or not, it supposes that the free agents will have power to choose or refuse, do or not, and that the events are contingent and what may not be, though it is certain that they will be.

Every man who acts freely knows he may act or not, and there is no disputing against common sense. The conscience of every sinner, even the most wicked wretch upon earth, witnesses that there is not any sin which is inevitably committed by him, but that he has power enough to abstain from it. On the other hand, there is a fixed impression in the human mind of the Omniscience of God—our ordinary conversation is evidence of this. Ask the rich, the poor, the speculator, the foolish, or the thoughtful what will be the issue of such and such thing; what difficulties, impediments, or hindrances will be met with, and what will be the result—they will all answer, "God knows." Naturally, man has no doubt on the subject, for the providence of God follows so evidently and necessarily from a knowledge of His Being and

attributes, His omniscience is so essential to support His providence, that none but Atheists have any difficulty on the point.

It is quite clear that God's foreknowledge or prescience is not confined to His own decrees or appointments, for were this so we should either have to hold that His knowledge is finite or that He decrees evil. In fact, it is the limiting of the foreknowledge of God to His decretal appointments, which leads the hyper-Calvinist to regard the Creator as the appointor of all the evil in the universe. The foreknowledge of God embraces far more than the results of His own decrees; it embraces all the possible actions of His creatures. He is so intimately acquainted with the essential properties of all creatures that all their future volitions and motions, good and evil, are clearly foreseen. He knows how every man will act under every possible circumstance, as certainly as if volition and action had been most absolutely decreed. And, to affirm that God can only know what He has appointed and decreed to take place, is to place an unwarrantable limitation upon the wisdom and knowledge of the Infinite, and to attribute sin to the Fountain of Holiness. On this principle He could not know that sin would exist in this world until He had ordained that it should by an unchangeable decree. Did not the Almighty foreknow that Cain would slay his brother Abel, and yet, can it be thought that He made a decree whereby the one brother became a murderer? Truly, as the poet Milton says: "We must hold that God foreknows all future events, but that He has not decreed them all absolutely, lest all sin should be imputed to the Deity, and evil spirits and wicked men should be exempted from blame."[1]

It is clear the Almighty, from the perfection of His nature, foreknows the actions of His creatures, whether good or evil. He foreknows, also, our thoughts, not only what we do think, but what we shall think, before the thoughts enter our minds.[2] He knows, and must of necessity know, how every man will act in every possible contingency, and the sins of all creatures from the beginning to the end of time must be manifest to Him, without any appointment on His part by which these sins would be attributable to Himself.[3]

Moral evil, or the sinfulness of a moral act, cannot be the subject of a Divine decree, for it would be absurd to suppose that the Almighty would decree that which it is contrary to His nature to

[1] Milton's *Christ. Doctr.*, p. 41.

[2] Jer. xvi. 17, xxxii. 19, xxxiii. 24; Heb. iv. 13; Prov. xv. 3; Psl. cxxxix. 2; 2 Kings viii. 12, 13; John xxi. 17.

[3] The robbing of God of His Prescience was one of the errors of Socinus. His words are plain (prælec. cap. xi.): Cum igitur nulla ratio, nullus Sacrarum literarum locus sit, ex quo aperte collegi possit, Deum omnia quæ fiunt, scivisse ante quam fierent, concludendum est, minime a nobis asserendam esse istam Dei præscientiam; præsertim, cum et rationes non paucæ, et Sacra Testimonica non desint unde eam plane negandam esse appareat. See also Smalinus, Dis. xii., de causâ peccati in Thes. 3, and Crellius, lib de Deo et Attr, cap. 24, 201.

effect. The Almighty acts for some certain end which is worthy of Himself. He has His own Divine Plan—marvellous in wisdom and glory.

In the general design, all persons, actions, and circumstances must have been considered and foreknown, for how could all events be wisely directed to any one end without a full and perfect view thereof. Providence is the preparing and ordaining of means for effecting the end the Almighty has in view—all His counsels, decrees, and actions must needs be wise, free, great, and good. He would not suffer sin or any evil to intervene so as to ultimately defeat His design. For wise ends He may for a time permit evil to enter, but only that He may limit, overrule, and direct it to becoming purposes, and bring good out of it.

That God foreknew that sin would be in the world arises from the absolute perfection of the Divine nature. There is no darkness nor shadow of death where the workers of iniquity may hide themselves. Without this knowledge He could not judge the world; without this foreknowledge He could not limit or overrule events so as to prevent the obstruction of His eternal purpose, or so direct them as in fact to make them operate in effecting His blessed design.

That God could have excluded sin from His creature, had He thought fit, is certain from His infinite power, but the fact of His foreknowledge of its existence, and of His not having excluded it, is very far from proving it to be the subject of a Divine Decree. To foreknow a thing and to decree it are two very different things. The foreknowledge, and even the permission, of an event does not necessarily suppose any act of the will or desire for its fulfilment or accomplishment, but it may be the very reverse, and in fact is so in the case of sin. But a decree implies the exercise and approval of the will. In the decree is manifest the desire for its accomplishment. It cannot be regarded as consistent with the wisdom and sincerity of the Most High to decree a thing, and yet by His word forbid it. If God has decreed a certain sin, how can He consistently threaten punishment for the doing of it, since it must be done by virtue of the power of His own determination?

Moral evil does not arise, as Archbishop King asserts, "from the very nature and constitution of created beings, and could not be avoided without a contradiction;" for that is manifestly untrue, as the condition of unfallen creatures demonstrates. God made all things at first in perfection; Satan primarily, and then the depraved heart of man has been the author of all moral evil.

We must be careful when we admit that God permits sin, that we allow no more than that He does not interpose His power to hinder the perpetration thereof, for though it is true He governs His creatures by moral means, and does not forcibly

restrain their wills and offer violence to their nature, yet the Judge of all the Earth can never give any permission to perpetrate moral evil. His immutable holiness renders this utterly impossible. The very constitution of all His moral creatures, as well as His direct command, forbids that which God hates, and the very essence of sin consists in this, that it is done without the permission of God, and in direct opposition to His will. The expression, therefore, God's permission of sin, has a tendency to mislead.

We have now to consider one of the objections to the foreknowledge of God to which we have already briefly alluded. It is objected that it has the effect of compelling or constraining the actions of men, and of rendering the existence of their actions necessary.

But how can an action be less free because it is foreknown by God? The powers, the circumstances, and the actions of the man remain exactly the same, whether these are known to the Creator or not, the man being perfectly ignorant what the actions are that are thus foreknown.

It is impossible that this foreknowledge can affect the nature of the actions in any manner or the freedom of the man. It wonld be different had the foreknowledge any influence on the agent, but this, of course, it has not, for Divine prescience has no element of causality in it. As a practical matter it never enters into the mind of a person that his anticipation of another's conduct lays any restraint upon that man's course of action. The contemplation is relative to himself, not to the other. The greater or less degree of certainty in the mind of one as to the course of action to be adopted by the other, would not affect in any way that man's conduct. Is there any real difference because the knowledge exists in the mind of the Infinite? True, He cannot be deceived, His knowledge must be perfect, His knowledge is always accompanied or followed by the event, but that knowledge not being known to us, how can it influence our conduct?

Suppose the case of God by immediate revelation giving to one the knowledge of an event which He foresees will happen in the life of another; would this knowledge in the mind of one have any influence over the actions of the other? Surely not. And yet the knowledge would be as certain and infallible as God's own knowledge. Dr. Whitby illustrates this by a comparison of our own knowledge. He says, we know certainly that some things are, and that some things will be, as that the sun will rise to-morrow, and when we thus know they are or will be, they cannot but be; yet manifest it is that our knowledge does not at all affect the things we thus know, to make them either more certain, or more future than they would be without it. Now, foreknowledge in God is knowledge; as therefore knowledge has no influence on things that are, so neither has foreknowledge on things that shall be, and

consequently, the foreknowledge of every action that would be otherwise free, cannot alter or diminish that freedom.[1]

This is agreeable with what Theodoret says, referring to the passage in the 8th chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, on predestination. "Let no one say that foreknowledge is the cause of these things; for foreknowledge did not make them such, but God, as God, foreknew at a distance what would happen. For if I, seeing a high spirited horse champing his bit, and by no means enduring his rider, should say that he would go down a precipice when he comes near it, and it should happen as I said it would—I did not throw the horse down the precipice, but I foretold what would happen, forming my opinion from the fierceness of the horse. The God of the Universe, as God, knows all things at a distance; He does not, however, necessitate one man to practise virtue, and another to work wickedness. For if He Himself forced to either, He could not justly applaud and crown the one, and decree punishment against the other. But if God be just, as He assuredly is, He encourages to what is good, and dissuades from the contrary; He praises the workers of goodness, and punishes those who are voluntarily wicked."[2]

But it is urged that there is this essential difference between the knowledge of man and that of God—the knowledge of the former does not influence the event, while the knowledge of the latter does. He who is all-powerful, say the advocates of necessity, who made all things as they are, and who knows all that will come to pass, must be regarded as rendering that *necessary* which He foreknows, just as an individual may be considered accessory to the event which he anticipates, exactly in proportion to the share he has had in preparing the instruments, or forming the minds of those who are to bring it about.

But there is a wild assumption here—an assumption that the *knowledge* is connected with the event. It is not because one knows what will follow, but because he contributes towards it, that it can be said to be influenced by him.

Jonathan Edwards, in his celebrated work on the Freedom of the Will, dwells much upon the distinction between *making* the event necessary, and *proving* it to be necessary. In his chapter which he heads: "God's certain foreknowledge of the future volitions of Moral Agents inconsistent with such a contingence of

[1] We are fully aware that Archbishop Whately considers this argument unsatisfactory, and that his admission is made much of by the late Dr. Cunningham.—*Historical Theology*, vol. 2, p. 444.

[2] Sirmond's Ed., vol iii. p. 68. So Epiphanius says: "Although Scripture declared that Christ would be crucified, and although Divine Scripture mentioned the sins which would be committed by us in the latter days, yet no one of us who commit sins can find an excuse by producing the testimony of Scripture foretelling that these things would happen; for we do not these things because Scripture foretold them, but Scripture foretold them, through the foreknowledge of God, because we were about to do them." Petavius's Edit., p. 575.

those volitions as is without all necessity"; he says, "Whether prescience be the thing that makes the event necessary or no, it alters not the case. Infallible foreknowledge may *prove* the necessity of the event foreknown, and yet not be the thing which *causes* the necessity. If the foreknowledge be absolute, this proves the event known to be necessary, or proves it is impossible but that the event should be, by some means or other, either by a decree, or some other way, if there be any other way; because, it is absurd to say, that a proposition is known to be certainly and infallibly true which yet may possibly prove not true."[1]

But infallible foreknowledge, while it remains foreknowledge, *proves* nothing. God's prescience alone certainly cannot render any actions necessary in the sense of compulsory. The person who thus reasons confounds between God's foreknowledge and His decrees. This is the Calvinist's great error—the making the divine prescience an active compelling power, ignoring the fact of it being an intellectual perfection, and not an active power in any way. The Prescience of God is not the same as His will. He foresees all the actions of men, both those which are conformable and those which are contrary to His will.

By his foreknowledge the Almighty may see some actions to be necessary, but does most certainly not render them so by such foreknowledge, for then would God cease to be a free agent.

"That men lie under no necessity from God's foreknowledge may thus be proved," says Origen,[2] "because the prophets are exhorted in the Holy Scriptures to call men to repentance, and to do this in such words as if it were unknown whether they would turn to God, or would continue in their sins, as in those words of Jeremiah: 'perhaps they will hear and turn every man from his evil way,' &c.; and this is said not that God understood not whether they would do this or not—ἀλλ' οἱονεὶ τὸ ἰσοστάσιον τῶν δυνάμεων γίνεσθαι δεικνὺς, but to demonstrate the almost equal balance of their power so to do, and that they might not despond or remit of their endeavours by an imagination that God's foreknowledge laid a necessity upon them, as not leaving it in their power to turn to Him, and so was the cause of their sin."

And in another place this same father says: "It must be owned, not that God's prescience is the cause of things future, but that their being future is the cause of God's prescience that they will

[1] Much of Edwards's reasoning hinges on the force he gives to the word 'necessity.' He admits that philosophical necessity is improperly called necessity. It is in effect nothing different from certainty. When it is asserted that God's prescience renders no action necessary—necessary is used in the sense of compulsory—but Edwards would understand it as used by his opponents in the sense of certainty. When the assertor intends to convey the idea that liberty consists in freedom from compulsion, Edwards would understand him as if he intended to convey the idea as well of freedom from certainty in the event, as from compulsion in the production of it. But there is a marked difference between certainty and necessity, and it is quite possible to know things as certain without knowing them as necessary.

[2] Apud Euseb. Præp. Ev. lib. vi. c. ii.

be."[1] And this is very true, prescience is not the cause of things future, but their being future is the reason of their being foreseen. Thus man, perishing by reason of his own wilfulness, is the cause of God's prescience that he will perish, and it is so because God's foreknowledge neither makes nor changes the object, but sees it as it truly is, and therefore must see that action to be freely and contingently future, which indeed is so, and that to be necessarily future which is so. This is so evident that even Hobbes, who held the doctrine of the necessity of all things, admits the truth in these words, "that the foreknowledge of God should be the cause of anything cannot be truly said, for foreknowledge is knowledge, and knowledge depends on the existence of the things known, and not they on it." In short, there is this distinction between predetermination and foreknowledge; the former is the antecedent of an event, the latter is only a logical consequence of it. Predetermination causes the event, foreknowledge is logically caused by the event.

Though we cannot comprehend how it is that the Deity can know future contingencies, we may readily admit that He from whom no secrets are hid, and before whom things past and to come meet in one unmovable everlasting present, must foresee the motions and actions of all His free agent creatures. It is this which gives occasion to the scoffer to ask, "How is it then that knowing that man will certainly abuse His goodness, He bestows upon them His initial salvation"? "How is it that the Creator should render their condemnation the greater, by conferring upon them grace, which He knows they will certainly reject"? But let us ask, is there anything unjust or unrighteous in creating free agents and placing them in a state of probation that they may be wisely rewarded for their obedience, or justly punished for their disobedience, and does it not follow that if they are free agents in a state of trial they must be free to stand or fall? The Rev. John Fletcher[2] in considering this subject places himself in the position of God, and in his peculiar language thus eludicates the matter: "Let me expostulate a moment with thee. I foresaw, indeed, that the slothful unfaithful man, to whom I gave one talent, would bury it to the last; but if I had kept it from him, if I had afforded him no opportunity of showing his faithfulness or his unfaithfulness, what could I have done with him? Had I sent him to hell upon foreseen disobedience, I should have acted the absurd and cruel part of a judge, who hangs an honest man to-day, under pretence that he foresees the honest man will turn thief to-morrow; had I

[1] Apud Eus. Præpar, Ev. 16 c. 11. St. Jerome has a similar expression: Non enim ex eo quod Deus scit futurum aliquid, id circo futurum est, sed quia futurum est, Deus novit.—Com. in Jer. So Origen, in another place, says that τὸ ἐσόμενον αἴτιον τοῦ τοιάν δε εἶναι τὴν περὶ αὐτοῦ προγνωσιν, that a thing being future is the cause of God's foreknowledge of it; for not because it is known is it future, but because it will be, therefore it is known. Com. in Gen. and in Rom. lib. vii.

[2] Equal Check to Pharisaism and Antinomianism.

taken him to heaven, I should have rewarded foreseen unfaithfulness with heavenly glory. And, had I refused to let him come into existence, my refusal would have been attended with a glaring absurdity, and with two great inconveniences: 1. With a glaring absurdity, for if I foresee that a man will certainly bury his talent; and if, upon this foresight, I refuse that man existence, it follows I foresaw that a thing which shall never come to pass shall certainly come to pass. And what can be more unworthy of me, and more absurd, than such a foresight? 2. The notion that my foreknowledge of the man's burying his talent should have made me suppress his existence is big with two great inconveniences. For, first I should have defeated my own purpose, which was to show my distributive justice, by rewarding him if he would be faithful, or by punishing him if he would continue in his unfaithfulness. And, secondly, I should have broken almost without interruption the laws of the natural world, and nipped the man's righteous posterity in the bud."

Whatever difficulty there may be in reconciling the Prescience of God with freedom of human action, it does not affect the truth that both exist.[1] Scripture affirms the one as strongly as it affirms the other, and we must bow to the Sacred authority and admit both with the acquiescence of humble faith. The difficulty evidently arises from the human faculties being inadequate to the full comprehension of the attributes and government of the Infinite. It is the peculiarity of the mode of divine Prescience which presents the greatest difficulty. We have no faculty approaching it which by intensifying in degree we can assign to the Deity as its prototype. We are constituted so as to have an intuitive knowledge of many things past, but we have no intuitive knowledge of a future. Had the position been reversed, and instead of being so constituted as to have an intuitive knowledge of the past, we had been so constituted as to have an intuitive knowledge of the future, we should have had no difficulty in assigning Prescience to the Deity, but rather have had difficulty in admitting His knowledge of things that are past. For precisely the same difficulty exists in proving that the past actions of a free agent cannot be remembered as in proving that the actions of a free agent cannot be foreknown. Every argument brought to prove the impossibility of Prescience proves with equal force the impossibility of memory.[2] We have not a sufficiently

[1] "The reconciling the Prescience of God with the Free will of Man, Mr. Locke, after much thought on the subject, freely confessed he could not do, though he acknowledged both. And what Mr. Locke could not do, in reasoning upon subjects of a metaphysical nature, I am apt to think few men, if any, can hope to perform."—Lord Lyttelton's letter to Mr. West.

[2] "The faculty of memory in ourselves," says Reid (Powers of the Human Mind), convince us from fact, that it is not impossible that an intelligent being, even a finite being, should have certain knowledge of past actions of free agents, without tracing them from anything necessarily connected with them. If it be true that nothing can be

perfect and intimate perception of the *mode* of divine knowledge, the extent of divine agency, or of the laws regulating thought and volition in the human mind to solve the difficulties with which this subject is involved, but we can see that they are by no means so great as the difficulties in which we should be entangled were we to reject either the Prescience of God on the one hand or the freedom of the human will on the other. For if to maintain the former according to some parts of Scripture we were to reject those parts which imply the free agency of man, we should have to encounter all the most objectionable consequences of absolute Predestination—we should have to accept the doctrine that God is the author of sin—and that a man is eternally lost for not doing that which he never had the power of doing, and at the same time reject the clearest conclusions of reason and deny the consciousness of our inmost soul which at present is in harmony with the whole tenor of Scripture. And on the other hand, if to maintain free will we were to deny the Prescience of God, we should be driven to reject the authority of Holy Scripture entirely,[1] and in fact the whole series of the divine dispensations. Let us, therefore, as Dr. Graves says,[2] study not to be wise above what is written, but let us admit equally all the doctrines clearly promulgated in Scripture—doctrines, which as they are certainly analogous to the system of nature, we may reasonably expect to find in the Word of God, and which, therefore, do not diminish, but on the contrary, increase the credibility of the divine word, and do not undermine but establish its evidence. With this conviction we shall not suffer our faith to be shaken by apparent difficulties which we are unable in the present life to solve. But convinced that we at present see "through a glass darkly" we shall wait for the removal of those difficulties which now perplex our reasonings until that day "when we shall know, even as we are known," and enjoy unclouded knowledge and unsullied bliss in the presence of our God.

It is next urged that, assuming that the foreknowledge of God does not place a restraint on the action of man, yet when He makes a *declaration* of this foreknowledge it does. It is argued that what is declared by God as future is necessary, it is impossible it should not be; what will be is *certain*, what is certain is *fixed*, what is fixed is no longer *free* but necessary. As soon as it is true that a thing will be, it is certain, fixed, *necessary*, it *must* be,

known to arise from what does exist, but what necessarily arises from it, it must be equally true, that nothing can be known to have gone before what does exist but what must necessarily have gone before it. If it be true, that nothing future can be known unless its necessary cause exist at present, it must be equally true that nothing past can be known unless something consequent with which it is necessarily connected exists at present."—See Cairns on *Moral Freedom*, Part VI., ch. 3, § 2.

[1] "He understandeth our thoughts afar off—and every word in our tongue He knoweth it altogether." Ps. cxxxix. 2—4.

[2] Calvinistic Predestination, p. 16.

it is impossible it should not be, unless it be true that it will be and yet *will not be* at the same time. If by this necessity, a necessity of infallibility is intended which, however, is not a proper necessity at all, and if all that is meant is that the future event will certainly happen, this may be allowed, but if it is intended that by the infallible knowledge of God, or by His declaration of this knowledge, a restraint is placed upon the creature, this we emphatically deny.

The certainty of the event, as we have already shown, is not by any means inconsistent with its contingency, or the freedom of the agent. The two words do not represent the same thing. Certainty arises from the infallible foresight of the agent's future choice—contingency from the manner in which the event is to be brought about. If the *foreknowledge* of God is not to be regarded as imposing a constraint or necessity on the events themselves, how can His declaration of this foreknowledge do so? "These things have I told you, that when the time shall come ye may remember that I told you of them."[1] He makes the declaration for the confirmation of faith. It is true that the prophecy must be accomplished, but the prediction is not the *efficient cause* of its being accomplished. The free agency of man is not affected by the declaration any more than it was by the knowledge. The *effects* are produced by the free agency of man, not by reason of the declaration; were it otherwise, the prophecy would be made the *cause* of its own fulfilment which is a conclusion quite unwarranted.

There is a remarkable illustration in the history of David and Saul of the truth that even the declaration of God's foreknowledge does not fetter the free agency of man. It well shows the consistency of the Divine prescience with the contingency of human actions and the conditionality of the Divine determinations concerning them. The case is related in the 1st Book of Samuel,[2] "And it was told Saul that David was come to Keilah. And Saul said God hath delivered him into mine hand; for he is shut in, by entering into a town that hath gates and bars. And Saul called all the people together to war, to go down to Keilah to besiege David and his men. And David knew that Saul secretly practised mischief against him; and he said to Abiathar the priest, Bring hither the ephod. Then said David, O Lord God of Israel, thy servant hath certainly heard that Saul seeketh to come to Keilah to destroy the city for my sake. Will the men of Keilah deliver me into his hands? Will Saul come down, as thy servant hath heard? O Lord God of Israel, I beseech thee, tell thy servant. And the Lord said, He will come down. Then said David, will the men of Keilah deliver me and my men into the hand of Saul? And the Lord said, They will deliver thee up. Then David and

[1] John xvi. 4. [2] 2 Sam. xxiii. 7.

his men, which were about six hundred, arose and departed out of Keilah, and went whithersoever they could go. And it was told Saul that David was escaped from Keilah, and he forbare to go forth."

This seems rather to show that though there may be some events absolutely decreed by God, yet all are not so, and certainly to prove that His prescience does not interfere with the contingency of human conduct. It goes to disprove the theory that God ordains first how men shall act, and then because He has so ordained, foresees their conduct which of course in such case would be absolutely fixed; and to prove that He knows how men will act under every possible contingency. Thus in the case above, the course of action of Saul and the men of Keilah in the happening of certain events which never did happen was foreseen and disclosed, and the revelation enabled David to change his action and frustrate the contingent course of action of his adversary.

God has Himself clearly shown us that He is not fettered by verbal restraint in His purposes of mercy unto His people, and the Scriptures contain many blessed instances where even the formal declaration of His vengeance has been put aside when the sinner has turned unto Him and besought the remission of the sentence. Recall to mind the sentence passed by Him on Ahab through the mouth of the prophet Elijah,[1] and the case of Hezekiah,[2] when the Lord said, "I have heard thy prayer, I have seen thy tears, behold I will heal thee."

The main difficulty in the way of understanding Predestination is that the nature and attributes of God are so infinitely superior to those of man that it is almost impossible for finite creatures to draw accurate conclusions from them—such conclusions being based on analogous conclusions drawn from the nature and attributes of man.

The nature of God is incomprehensible to human understanding. It is revealed to faith which is the gift of God. Many of the descriptions we have of God and of His Divine attributes are not taken from any direct and immediate perceptions we have of Him or them, but from observations we have made of His works, and from the consideration of those qualities which we conceive would enable us to perform the like.[3] This is the best we can do: we do know that we were created in the image of God, but revelation goes not into particulars. The scholastic maxim is "affectus in Deo denotat effectum," *i.e.*—that when an affection, or passion, or an emotion is attributed to the Almighty Being, we are to understand the existence of some quality in Him producing effects like those of the qualities named when existing in ourselves. When, therefore, apart from revelation, we attribute wisdom, justice, and

[1] 1 Kings xxi. [2] 2 Kings xx. [3] King on Predestination.

foreknowledge to God, we do so because He appears to act as if these faculties were His, but we are conscious that in Him they must be infinitely removed in degree to that attributable to the creature. His attributes are the originals so to speak, the true things of a nature so infinitely superior in degree to anything discernible in the creature or that can be conceived by our finite understanding, that we can only make deductions therefrom based on the reflection of these attributes in ourselves with reverence and godly fear.

God is said to be revealed to us in Scripture not as He is *absolutely*, but as He is *relatively* to ourselves.[1] But the terms are not safe, and we must be careful how far we admit them. It will not do to make the knowledge we have of God and His purpose *relative* only: for then Revelation instead of being as we know absolutely Divine truth, would become an approach only to it. What in Holy Scripture is revealed to us concerning God and His attributes are realities and not simply figures. It would be nearer the truth to assign the realities to the Eternal and the figures to that which is in time. The reality to what is in God—the figure to what is in man. But it is true in a sense that the words *knowledge, counsel, will, predestination, decree,* and so forth, as applied to the Almighty are applied in an analogical sense only—in fact anthropopathically. They are borrowed from human affairs and are used as the best means, in fact the only means we have of expressing God's adorable perfections. As relating to Him they are imperfect expressions and are suitable only in the way of comparison or resemblance, and as helpful in forming some conception, however dim, of how we ought to think and act towards Him.

Take for instance the term *foreknowledge*—This is not strictly speaking in God, for were it so there would be in the Deity that which is changeable. For what would be foreknowledge with Him yesterday would be knowledge with Him to-day and hereafter, as there can be no foreknowledge of that which is present or past. And further, foreknowledge is formally and properly in the creature and there can be nothing formally in God which is formally in the creature, because could this be, then there would be something which is finite in God, or something which is infinite in the creature, both of which are impossible. It is the same with *knowledge.* Knowledge in God is very different in degree from knowledge in the creature—the latter is capable of increase or diminution, the former neither differs really or essentially from His nature, but is one with Him. It is neither capable of increase or diminution or growth or decay. Every-

[1] It was the saying of St. Augustine that "God has bowed down the Scriptures to the capacity even of babes and sucklings." Inclinavit Deus Scripturas ad infantium et lactentium capacitatem. Aug. in Psl. viii.

thing is at once and always present to Him. His knowledge is not effected by the progress of time; successive events as we regard them, add nothing to His knowledge. Our finite apprehensions compel us to conceive and speak of things as succeeding one another in point of time, but in the Divine mind there is no chasm between the events of the creation, of to-day, and to-morrow—all past, present, and future are at once open and present to the Almighty. It is not that succession is confounded in the mind of the Infinite, for He sees according to truth—things past as past, things future as future—but nothing past *goes from* Him, nothing future can be distant so as to come to Him, and hence everything is with him always.[1] He cannot lose or gain, forget or learn anything in point of knowledge.

The terms we have referred to therefore should never be used in relation to God without a reverential feeling of their inadequacy and imperfection to express the truth as existent in Him. There is much truth in the saying of St. Cyprian "Periculosum est de Deo etiam verum dicere."[2]

In 1699 Bishop Bunn published a small work in the form of a letter in answer to a book entitled "Christianity not Mysterious," in which he laid down the distinction between a *proper* and *immediate* conception, confining the first to the things of time and sense, and asserting the other as pertaining to our knowledge of God and the divine attributes; "in consequence of which," says he, "we are under a necessity of conceiving of things supernatural by analogy." Archbishop Tillotson, perceiving the danger of such a position, argued that if the moral attributes in God were not the same in *kind* with those in men, we could have no knowledge at all of them nor reason about them, and he distinctly asserted that the proposition that cogitations or thought, self notions, free will, and reflections, are in God Almighty the same in kind, though infinitely superior in degree, is as demonstrable as either His existence or any other of His moral or natural attributes, these being primary attributes common to all intelligences. In 1709 Archbishop King published his well-known discourse to show "the consistency of predestination and foreknowledge with the freedom of man's will," on the same foundation of analogy; but leaving out the essential distinction between metaphor and analogy. He contends that all we know of God is merely by *analogy*, *i.e.*, from what we see in ourselves and observe in others, compared with events produced by

[1] Philo De Mundo, § 7: ii., 609, Edit. Mang. Cudworth's Intellectual System, Ed. 1678, p. 644. As Augustine says, "In the eternal, speaking properly, there is neither anything past as though it had passed away, nor anything future as though it were not as yet; but whatsoever is, only is." De Civitate Dei, lib. lxxxiii., quæst. 19; see Confessions, lib. xi., cap. 10-13.

[2] It is similar to the Sext Pythag.—Nihil de Deo, quod non licet quæras; de Deo nihil dicas quod non didiceris a Deo.

the Divine Being, we conclude that there is something in God answering to these phenomena, though indeed very different from them. He was at once attacked by Dr. Edwards the Calvinist and Anthony Collins the Deist. This discourse of King's was unfortunately highly recommended by Dr. Copleston, and the danger of its tendency passed over lightly. King goes so far as to say that we can have no better notions of the Divine attributes "than a man born blind has of colours," though he allows that "they help us to form some notions, but these faint and inadequate of His divine perfections." King's views are dangerous as breaking down the connexion between reason and religion, as impairing the strength of our deductions from natural to revealed theology, and as undermining our faith in revelation.

How can the doctrines of the Incarnation of the Son of God, His mediation, and the operations of the Holy Spirit, be held as substantial truths, if the Divine nature and attributes possess no real affinity to our moral and intellectual constitutions? Bishop Berkeley was of opinion that King fell into his error from not having considered the Fifth Book of Euclid: he desired the Archbishop to speak of God and His attributes in the style of other Christians, allowing that knowledge and wisdom do, in the proper sense of the words, belong to God, and held that we have some notions, though infinitely inadequate to these Divine attributes, yet still more than a man blind from his birth can have of light and colours.[1]

The Catholic truth is that the wisdom and justice and goodness of God are of the same nature and kind, as the moral qualities so denominated in man, though of course infinite and perfect in extent and degree. Because in man these virtues fall short of perfection and differ infinitely in *degree*, therefore, that they are totally different in *kind* is a *non-sequitur*. As Dr. J. Clarke says in his Boyle Lectures "It may as well be affirmed that the light of a candle is in kind totally different from that of the sun, and such as would give a man no idea of *light at all*, if he had not seen the other, because there is an immense disproportion in intenseness betwixt them."

We must ever remember that the Word of God has revealed to us some of the attributes of the Deity, and where a truth has been revealed, we have no right to explain away the express character

[1] Theory of Vision Vindicated and Explained, p. 10. See the able arguments of Grinfield in his Vindiciæ Analogicæ; further on this subject see Brown's Procedure of Human Understanding, Intro., pp. 13-16, and pp. 141-142; Bishop Berkeley's Minute Philosophy, pp. 245-249, 255-258; Fiddes's Body of Divinity, vol. 1, bk. 1, pt. 2, p. 125; Bishop Warburton's Sermons, vol 1, pp. 38-39; Doddridge's Lectures, vol. 1, p. 187; Bates's Works, p. 512; Cudworth's Immutable Morality, pp. 255-256; Dr. Taylor's Ductor Dubitantium, bk. 1, ch. 2. p. 39; Bollingbrooke's Works, vol. 5, p. 524, 526, 536, 540.

of the revelation, or doubt its obvious meaning.[1] For instance, Holy Scripture describes the justice of God as exhibited in the moral government of the world in such a way as to justify us in forming the same conception of His justice as reason leads us to form of justice as a general rule of conduct. We are therefore warranted in assuming that the justice of God is such that He acts with strict impartiality to all, in short that "there is no respect of persons with God;"[2] but "that in every nation He that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted with Him."[3] Calvin affirms "it is acting a most perverse part to set up the measure of *human justice* as the standard by which to measure the justice of God." This is true as to degree and extent, but certainly not as to quality. What other standard have we? What other would it be possible to judge by? God Himself shows us in a remarkable instance that an appeal to reason on such a subject is not contrary to faith and piety, in the 18th chapter of the Book Genesis, "Shall not the judge of all the earth do right?" It is one thing to say that the Divine justice is incomprehensible, and another thing to say that the Divine justice is different from human justice; or that we are to have a different idea altogether of justice as a human and as a Divine characteristic. Such an idea is to confuse our moral notions entirely.

So also with regard to the mercy of God—however infinite and incomprehensive in extent and degree it may be to us, yet we are warranted by Revelation in holding that this, as displayed in the moral government of the world, is consistent with, or at least not opposed to the ideas of mercy which human reason and feeling necessarily lead us to form—ideas implanted in the human mind by the Almighty Himself. We are therefore justified in assuming that the mercy of God is such that every creature of His hand shall be subject to this divine influence—in other words that "the Lord is loving unto every man, and His mercy is over all His works."[4]

The dangerous doctrine of the relativity of human knowledge has in recent years found supporters in Sir William Hamilton and Dean Mansel, and has been carried to its logical result by Mr. Herbert Spencer. That all human knowledge is merely relative, and that God as He is in Himself we can never know, is a doctrine we cannot admit. Even Mr. Spencer acknowledges that the

[1] It should be noted that the arguments of Archbishops King and Whateley as to the analogical character of our knowledge of the attributes of God have been laid hold of by Calvinists not without justice in defence of their own system. Many of the strongest arguments of the Arminians against Calvinism have been those drawn from the moral attributes of the Almighty—His goodness, justice and holiness; consequently they are willing to accept the admission of the Archbishops as to the unwarrantable inferences drawn from the moral attributes, particularly as their own case mainly rests on the natural attributes of God—His power and supremacy, His knowledge and wisdom, carefully distinguishing the natural from the moral attributes.

[2] Rom. ii. 11. [3] Acts, x. 35. [4] Psl. cxlv. 9.

positive existence of the absolute is a necessary datum of consciousness. To admit that all knowledge is relative would be inconsistent with a knowledge of the existence even of the absolute; and how can we pronounce our knowledge to be limited, unless we have a consciousness at least of the existence of a something beyond this limit, which to our intelligence is inaccessible? It is obvious, then, that the capacity to point an absolute limit to thought implies that thought has already virtually transcended that limit. A higher Being alone could pronounce our knowledge to be relative only. He has not done so, and in fact Revelation is opposed to the idea.

It is impossible to deny that there is such a thing as an Election of some nations and of some men to certain blessings which other nations and other men are not privileged to enjoy. So far as we can see this election has no relation to the moral excellencies or qualities of the nations or individuals, but is dependent on the mere will and choice of the Almighty Father and Disposer of all things.

Have we not sufficient evidence of choice and election by the Almighty of such a nature as to be beyond the reach of mortal inquiry? Does not the birth and education of all depend upon the choice and providence of God? Does He not bestow on one abilities not given to others? Does not one receive five talents, another three and another one only? Are not the circumstances of the position in which one is born often such as to mould and direct the course of life of the individual whether for good or evil? Is it a matter of chance that one is born of parents opulent or poor, learned or ignorant—one born to wear a crown, another to beg from door to door? Why is one born to luxury and opulence, reared in indolence and gratified with every earthly pleasure, while another is born blind, deaf or deformed, reared in a garret and amid trial and hardship of the severest description? Is it not the providence of God that one is born a child of Christian parents rather than of Jewish, Mahometan, or Heathen?[1] Far be it from us to deny the choice of God or the absolute supremacy of the Creator in ordering all events and the destiny of every man according to His will. What *is* denied is that the Infinite is bound by laws which the ingenuity of man may lay down for His guidance under all circumstances.

St. Paul shows how every member of the Church even is not of equal honour. He compares the body mystical with the body natural, and points out that though our "uncomely parts" have not the honour put upon others, yet all are useful in their places. He shows that there are "diversities of gifts" and that "the

[1] Dr. Dwight has a very beautiful discourse on this subject. Serm. XVI.

manifestation of the spirit is given to every man to profit withal:" for the Spirit divides to every man, severally as he wills.[1] God hath "set the members every one of them in the body as it hath pleased Him."[2]

It is for this cause the apostle warns us "that no one be puffed up the one against the other," for "who maketh thee," he asks, "to differ from another? and what hast thou that thou didst not receive? now if thou didst receive it, why dost thou glory as if thou hadst not received it?"[3]

We are not able to solve the choice of God as thus manifested. It is only when God reveals Himself and some of His attributes, when he reveals His purpose and only so far as He does so, that we are able to see our way.

So far as Predestination, in the sense we have just referred to, is concerned, we can only see it from our own place. We can only accept of God's revelation of its truth in faith. We know the fact and we may gather further from His attributes that the Election which is founded on it, is defined, and that the individuals composing it are known to Him. But this is all we can know in our present condition of Election in God; or, to be more accurate, this is all we can contemplate by faith, for the revelation is made to faith—rather to the spirit of man than to his understanding.

How this conviction of faith is applicable to the actual condition of men in this life, we are unable to say. The attempt to explain it is useless, for the thing contemplated is in the region of the Incomprehensible; it is the province of the Creator and not of the creature. A line of demarcation is clearly drawn between apprehension of Election *in* God and the operation of the doctrine in regard to the creature.

We cannot see the operation of Predestination from God's place; our admission by faith of its truth does not enable us to define God's mode of working any more than our acknowledgment of faith in the Blessed Trinity enables us to define the mode of the operation of the Three in One. We can no more scan the purposes of the Omnipotent, than we can fathom the depths of the mighty ocean, with a line that has not yet measured the soundings of the harbour from whence we set out.

By faith only can we contemplate the Divine attributes and essences. We are not able to comprehend the Omnipresence, the Eternal Existence of God, or many other attributes of the Infinite Being; we are by faith only able to contemplate them as revealed to us. Were we to attempt to theorize upon these attributes, were we to attempt to draw conclusions according to the rules of the understanding, we should be landed immediately in grave difficulties. The attributes of the Infinite cannot be weighed in the

[1] 1 Cor. xii. 4—7, 11. [2] *Ib.* 18. [3] 1 Cor. iv. 6—7.

balance of the finite mind. And so with Predestination, so far as it is *in* God. It is a great and solemn truth—a truth found in Him who is Incomprehensible. It is based on premises of which we can form but a very poor conception, and is, in short, one of the aspects of His essential relation to His works, as Creator, Sustainer, and Supreme Sovereign, and Lord of all.

We know however this, that God's Predestination can be manifested only in perfect harmony with His whole attributes, and therefore must be holy, just, and good. It is a means by which He reveals His justice, and His mercy, and declares His glory to the children of men. The finite can comprehend only in the understanding so much, and such of, the attributes of the Infinite as the finite mind is capable of understanding, in its present condition; and in the spirit so much, and such of, the attributes of the Infinite, as God is pleased to reveal to faith.

God's revelation to us of His Predestination does not change our position, or our powers as creatures. It doubtless enlarges our knowledge and affords ground for our faith to rest upon, but it does not lift the creature mind into the region of the Infinite, nor enlarge the understanding to the comprehension of things pertaining to the Infinite. It instructs from "faith to faith."[1]

When we consider the vast extent of God's works—His infinite wisdom and power, and remember how small a part of his works, how infinitely little of His wisdom and power, our faculties in their present condition can embrace; and further how intimately connected are all the parts of the work of the Almighty, plainly indicating one scheme of which the remotest parts have numerous and complicated relations with each other, so that much of what we do not see is necessary and actually in operation for the production of what we do see, may we not, with justice, ascribe our perplexities, and our difficulties, to imperfect acquaintance with the objects of our speculation?

Even the actions of man we are unable properly to follow, the motives leading to the actions still less. The bounds of the human mind as well as of the human race are fixed; and beyond them it cannot pass. The voice of the Divine Being seems to be heard saying, "Thus far shalt thou go and no further." The bounds are distant far enough to leave a wide field of investigation, but every attempt to push inquiry beyond its legitimate limits, and to peer into the region of the incomprehensible is attended with danger—is unwise, and practically a distortion of those abilities with which we have been blessed.

Should any one judge that a righteous man is righteous and inherits eternal life, and that a wicked man is wicked and receives eternal death because of the Divine decree, he commits the error of attempting to arrive at the fact from the Incomprehensible,

[1] Rom. i. 17.

whereas the Incomprehensible can only be apprehended by revelation in word or in fact. We can understand "the invisible things" of God, only by "the things that are made"[1] through "faith in His operation."[2] We cannot conceive or know them *a priori*; for the Divine action in the Incomprehensible is to be seen interpreted in the fact. We must not therefore look to the Incomprehensible, assume a decree, and say because of *this* the actions of men are good or bad, as the case may be; but we must look to the fact, and work upwards from *that*. We must look to the exercise of the powers of the creature,—see the use he makes of the gifts with which God has endowed him, and in *this*, not in the predestination decree, will be found the reason of his ultimate destiny. The reward of some and the punishment of others are conditions known to us by revelation; but the conduct upon which these respective results are based and without which they cannot be connected with individual men belongs to the men. Our faith that God does order the ultimate condition and destiny of men is based on revelation; but neither the possession of this faith nor the conviction arising therefrom, however strong, can authorise us to deduce the acts which are the cause of that condition and destiny. We cannot deduce facts from faith, or from the Incomprehensible. The acts of the creature are derived from the creature-will and not from the Divine.

It is at once true that all things are predestined by God to effect His purpose, and that every reasonable creature will have to answer for his share in them. But the action of the creature in relation to the predestined purpose of God does not stand in the position of effect to cause. God's Election must, as we have said, be in perfect harmony with all His moral attributes as revealed in Holy Scripture. It must be in harmony with His perfect love, His marvellous grace, His infinite mercy, His untold righteousness, His unapproachable holiness. It must be in harmony with the wonderful scheme of redemption which He has unfolded to us in His written Word, and manifested in the Person of the Incarnate Word. It must be in keeping with His gracious declarations that He willeth not the death of a sinner,[3] that His goodness and mercy "are over all His works,"[4] that Christ is "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world,"[5] and that the gospel, that "Christ tasted death for every man,"[6] is to be preached to "every creature which is under heaven."[7]

Many writers on the subject seem to think that so long as the doctrine of Predestination is reconcilable with one of the attributes of God, this is all that is necessary, and this even though it be utterly incompatible with other attributes of the Deity. Thus we find that Calvinist writers in maintaining their doctrine of

[1] Rom. i. 20. [2] Heb. xi. 3. [3] Ezek. xxxiii. 11.
[4] Ps. cxlv. 9. [5] John i. 29. [6] Heb. ii. 9. [7] Col. i. 23.

absolute decrees ask—Has not the Being who created all mankind the power to dispose of His creatures as He thinks fit? No one denies the power to appoint some to everlasting life and to consign others to everlasting damnation irrespective of their actions, but the question is, would such an exercise of power be consistent with infinite justice and infinite mercy, attributes which every Christian admits to be proper to God? It seems to be forgotten that the Infinite has other attributes than His almighty supreme power.

The harshness, judgment and sense of preference and exclusion which have come to be associated with the doctrine of Predestination, and which have rendered it repulsive to many pious and earnest Christians, and unprofitable rather than profitable, have no just foundation in the nature of that doctrine as revealed in Holy Scripture. They arise from the false and fanciful meanings men have so frequently attributed to the doctrine. The true practical reason for one man being saved and another lost, and the only reason intelligible to us is that the former when tried proves to have a faithful and obedient heart, and the latter the reverse. Those who will be condemned will be condemned not because of any decree of predestination, but because of sin. Men will be judged not according to an *eternal decree,* but according to their works done in time.

Augustine held that there was an Eternal Divine Decree separating, antecedently to any difference of desert, one portion of the human race from another, ordaining one to everlasting life and the other to everlasting misery: that God resolved from all eternity to deliver some whom He had chosen out of pure mercy without any regard to their future merits, and from all eternity He prepared for those who were thus chosen those gifts and graces which are necessary to save them infallibly, and these He bestows upon them in time. All those, therefore, who are of this number, hear the gospel and believe and persevere in the faith working out by love their salvation to the end of their lives. If they happen to wander from the right way, they return, and repent of their sins, and it is certain that they shall all die in the grace of Jesus Christ.

He did not consider reprobation like predestination. He thought God did not positively cast away any man—in fact He predestinated none to damnation. He simply *knows* those that are left in that mass of perdition and are not of the happy number of those whom He will deliver through mercy. These are at last condemned either because of original sin which is not remitted to them, and such are the children who die without receiving bap-

tism, or for the sins which by their free will they have added to the first sin; or because they did not persevere unto the end.

Hooker's statement of Augustine's doctrine of Predestination is very concise and accurate: "The whole body of mankind, in the view of God's eternal knowledge, lay universally polluted with sin worthy of condemnation and death; that over the mass of corruption there passed two acts of the will of God, an act of favour, liberality, and grace, choosing part to be made partakers of everlasting glory; and an act of justice, forsaking the rest and adjudging them to endless perdition; these, vessels of wrath; those, of mercy; which mercy is to God's elect so peculiar, and to them and none else (for their number is definitely known, and can neither be increased nor diminished), to them it allotteth immortality and all things thereunto appertaining; them it predestinateth, it calleth, justifieth, glorifieth them; it poureth voluntarily that spirit into their hearts, which spirit so given is the root of their very first desires and motions tending to immortality; as for others on whom such grace is not bestowed, there is justly assigned, and immutably to every one of them, the lot of eternal condemnation."

Augustine regarded Predestination as a mystery—a mystery, the foundation whereof is apparently inconsistent with our natural ideas of justice, and to be resolved only into the Sovereign will of God. "God," says he, "does not harden sinners by obliging them to sin (this was left for later and more rash followers of the great bishop to assert), but by withholding grace, such grace being withheld from those from whom it is withheld according to an occult justice, infinitely removed from human perceptions."[1] And again, "Why He wills to convert some and to punish others for being unconverted, let none presume to ask as if to blame God . . . for the law of His secret justice rests with Him alone."[2]

The Predestination he treats of is not to means of grace only, but of individuals to eternal life and final glory. He rejects any such cause as foreseen goodness, or foreseen faith, assigning as the only ground the absolute and inscrutable Divine choice. On the text John xv. 16, "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you," he says, "This then is the immovable truth of predestination. For what is it that the Apostle says, 'As He hath elected us in Himself before the foundation of the world?'[3] And assuredly, if this were said because God foreknew that they would believe, not because He Himself would make them believers, the Son is speaking against such a foreknowledge as that when He says, 'Ye have not chosen Me, but I have chosen you;' when God should rather have foreknown this very thing, that they

[1] De Dis. Quæst. ad Simplic., lib. i., Qu. 2., n. 16.

[2] De Pecc. Merit et Rem., lib. ii., c. 32.

[3] Eph. i. 4.

themselves would have chosen Him so that they might deserve to be chosen by Him. Therefore they were elected before the foundation of the world with that predestination in which God foreknew what He Himself would do: but they were elected out of the world with that calling whereby God fulfilled that which He predestinated." [1]

Augustine makes original sin the main basis of Predestination. "The whole human mass," says he, "was so justly condemned in the apostate root, that, were none rescued from that damnation none could blame God's justice. Those who are rescued are rescued gratuitously, those who are not but show what the whole lump deserved, even the rescued themselves, had not undeserved mercy succoured them." [2]

"Men are not condemned without having sinned, inasmuch as sin has passed to all from one, in whom, previous to their separate individual sins all have sinned in common. And on this account every sinner is inexcusable, either by the guilt of his origin, or the addition of his own will, whether he knows or whether he is ignorant; for ignorance itself is sin beyond question in those who are unwilling to learn, and in those who are not able, is the punishment of sin—so that of both the excuse is unjust—the damnation just. . . . What did He love in Jacob but the free gift of His own mercy? What did He hate in Esau but original sin?" [3]

Scripture does not reveal to us the mode by which two truths undoubtedly taught therein may be completely harmonized. We have the doctrine of Predestination, and the truth of the freedom of the human will. Almost all the errors into which men have fallen in these subjects may be referred to the desire to go beyond Scripture, and to reduce to a system what is there taught as two distinct truths. There have been those who held so purely to one of these truths as to draw inferences therefrom which necessarily shut out the other truth. Augustine was no exception. He held the doctrine of Predestination in such a way as to partially shut out the truth of the freedom of the human will. His system could not give free scope to both truths, and he held one to the rejection of the other, and his truth became destructive of itself the moment the border line was passed, and it trespassed on the other revealed truth. He found the two truths in Scripture: he could not reconcile them; and instead of accepting both in humility and without endeavouring to harmonize what his natural reason told him could not be harmonized, he accepted one and held it in such a way as to reject the other.

He accepted eagerly all the passages of Holy Scripture on the Predestinarian side, and endeavoured to explain away all the

[1] De Præd. Sanct. c. 34.

[2] Enchiridion, c. 99.

[3] Epist. cxciv. c. 6, 8.

statements therein which appeared to him to conflict with these. The late Dr. Mozley, who particularly examined St. Augustine's doctrine, has clearly shown this error of the great bishop, and in a single passage has concisely summed up his view. He says,[1] "St. Augustine then takes that further step which Scripture avoids taking, and asserts a determinate doctrine of Predestination. He erects those passages of Scripture which are suggestive of Predestination into a system, explaining away the opposite ones; and converts the obscurity and inconsistency of Scripture language into that clearness and consistency by which a definite truth is stated. His was the error of those who follow without due consideration that strong first impression which the human mind entertains, that there must be some definite truth to be arrived at on the question under consideration, whatever it may be; and who, therefore, imagine that they cannot but be doing service, if they only add to what is defective enough to make it complete, or take away from what is ambiguous enough to make it decisive. Assuming arrival at some determinate truth necessary, he gave an exclusive development to those parts of Scripture which he had previously fixed on as containing, in distinction to any apparently opposite ones, its real meaning. But the assumption itself was gratuitous. There is no reason why Scripture should not designedly limit itself, and stop short of expressing definite truth: though whether it does so or not is a question of fact. If Revelation as a whole does not state a truth of Predestination, that stopping short, is as much a designed stopping short, as a statement would have been a designed statement. Nor are we to be discontented with the former issue, when the comparison of one part of God's word with another fairly leads to it; to suppose that an indeterminate conclusion must be a wrong one, and to proceed to obtain by forced interpretation what we had failed to do by natural. If Revelation as a whole does not speak explicitly, Revelation did not intend to do so; and to impose a definite truth upon it, when it designedly stops short of one, is as real an error of interpretation as to deny a truth which it expresses."

The doctrine of absolute predestination which Augustine held, necessarily involved the doctrine of irresistible grace, for the end implies the means. He considered that grace imparted absolutely to the predestinated those acts and dispositions which are the condition of their final reward, and that the Divine decree in ensuring the end, ensures to them the means to it. That piety and virtue are the necessary means for attaining the end, he freely admitted, and his conclusion was that a grace must be given which would ensure the possession of the requisite piety and virtue.

He certainly adopts the language of the Catholic Church and speaks of grace as *assisting*, but he invariably uses it in the sense

[1] Augustinian Doctrine of Predestination, 3rd Ed., p. 147.

of controling, at least in his later writings, when his system had matured under his masterly hand.

He considers that not only the *power* to will and act is assisted by grace, but that will and action itself are assisted, and this not in the sense of the assisting of the faculties only, for by assistance of action he means a stronger kind of grace than that which assists the power to act, in short a grace which causes the action itself. The grace to which he gives the description of "*adjutorium voluntatis et actionis*," he endows with the effect of action, regarding it as a grace not only given that certain actions may be done, but as causing such actions to be done. It is true that he draws a distinction between two different kinds of grace, one "an assistance without which a thing cannot be done," and the other "an assistance by which a thing is done" (*adjutorium sine quo aliquid non fit*, and *adjutorium quo aliquid fit*.) The first he looks upon as sufficient for man in his unfallen state, but utterly insufficient for him in his fallen condition. In his treatise *De Correptione et Gratia* he enters fully into this distinction, saying,[1]—"The helps themselves are to be distinguished. The assistance without which a thing is not done is one thing, and the assistance with which a thing is done is another. For without food we cannot live; and yet although food should be at hand, it would not cause a man to live who should will to die. Therefore the aid of food is that without which it does not come to pass that we live, not that with which it comes to pass that we live. But, indeed, when the blessedness which a man has not is given him, he becomes continually blessed. For the aid is not only that without which that does not happen, but also with which that does happen for the sake of which it is given. Wherefore this is an assistance both by which it comes to pass, and without which it does not come to pass; because, on the one hand, if blessedness should be given to a man, he becomes continually blessed; and, on the other, if it should never be given, he will never be so. But food does not of necessity cause a man to live, and yet without it he cannot live. Therefore to the first man, who, in that condition of good in which he had been made upright, had received the ability not to sin, the ability not to die, the ability not to forsake that very condition of good, was given the aid of perseverance; not that by it, it might come to pass that he should persevere, but because without it he could not of free will persevere. But now to the saints predestination to the Kingdom of God by God's grace, the aid of perseverance that is given is not such as the former, but such that to them perseverance itself is bestowed; not only so that without that gift they cannot persevere, but moreover, so that by means of this gift they cannot help persevering."

[1] c. 34.

Augustine's two different kinds of grace were meted to the requirements of human nature—while nature was strong, grace was weak—while nature is weak, grace is strong and absolute.

Final perseverance is according to Augustine a Divine gift, not a gift bestowed in consideration of a man's previous acts, or as an assistance to his own efforts, but an absolute gift bestowed in accordance with an eternal Divine decree which has predestinated him to the privilege of it. "It is evident," says he, "that both the grace of the beginning and the grace of persevering to the end is not given according to our merits, but according to a most secret, most just, most wise, most beneficent will; inasmuch as whom He hath predestinated those He hath also called with that call of which it is said 'The gifts and callings of God are without repentance.'"[1] And again, "I am speaking of such as have not the gift of perseverance, but die in the decline of their good disposition, from good to evil. Let the objectors answer if they can, why when these were living faithfully and piously, God did not then snatch them from the perils of this life 'lest wickedness should change their understanding, and lest deceit should beguile their souls?'[2] Had he not this in His power, or was He ignorant of their future sinfulness? Assuredly nothing of the kind is said except most perversely and insanely. Why then did He not do this? Let them reply who mock at us when in such matters we exclaim, 'How unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out!' For either God gives this gift to whom He will, or Scripture is wrong."[3]

Augustine's view is then that the gift of final perseverance is the measure of Divine grace which is sufficient for salvation. He holds that by virtue of the decree of Predestination some are predestined from all eternity to be saved, and that as God saves the righteous only and not the wicked, He provides the necessary measure of goodness in the gift of final perseverance.

The basis of the Scheme of Augustine and those who have followed him is that Divine power must be an absolute unlimited thing. On this abstract idea is built up the Augustinian doctrine of Predestination and grace, just as on the other hand the Pelagian heresy was founded on the abstract idea of the human will as an unlimited faculty. The former is erroneous in assuming that the Divine power alone and of itself is a proper basis of a system irrespective of the clearly revealed truth of the freedom of the human will. The latter is erroneous in a far more serious sense: it offends against the first principles of piety and religion—it mistakes the idea of sin and perverts many of the fundamental truths of Christianity.

The Schoolmen's idea of Predestination agreed in the main

[1] Rom. xi. 29. [2] Wisd. iv. 11. [3] De Corr. et Grat. c. viii.

with Augustine's, but many of them somewhat modified his scheme.

Thomas Aquinas, the great representative of mediæval theology, held views on this subject in the main in harmony with Augustine. He rests the doctrine however chiefly on philosophy, and the idea of Divine power. All mankind being by virtue of the fall in a lost and ruined condition, the Almighty exercises His mercy on some, and His judgment upon others. The difference is not made on account of foreseen merit or demerit, for the difference in character between the one and the other is the effect of the determination, and the determination the effect of the difference. The predestination of the individual to eternal life, he held to include in it the bestowal of all those qualifications necessary to the attainment of this final state—the end including the means. No cause therefore was assigned for this predestination other than the sovereign will and pleasure of God. No creature had any ground of complaint, for all lay under condemnation and the exercise of mercy on the part of the Almighty could not be regarded as a wrong done to those who were merely left to what they had justly merited.

Archbishop Laurence in his Bampton Lectures asserts that the predestination held by the Schoolmen was a predestination resting on foreseen merit in the individuals, but he seems to have fallen into two errors here, one the confusing of all the Schoolmen together: whereas there were among the different schools some taking the predestinarian side and others taking the side of freewill; and the other the mistaking of the view actually maintained by Aquinas who distinctly asserts that foreseen merits are *not* the cause of predestination—*præscientia meritorum non est causa vel ratio predestinationis,* but that predestination is the cause of these foreseen merits—a very different position. Merit, in the strict sense of the word, as that on the ground of which something may be claimed as a due, a *meritum de condigno,* certainly could find no place in his scheme. It is true there might be a *meritum de congruo,* a merit constituting the condition under which God has found it proper to bestow His grace, but this was a merit far removed from what is ordinarily understood by the term. The principle was admitted that the bestowal of grace is always conditioned on the use made of it by freewill. The *meritum de congruo* was a certain susceptibility for divine communication by which the rational creature was able, with the moral power left in him to receive grace. It was the condition ordained of God under which He had decreed to bestow His gift in contradistinction to a merit in the strict sense of the term. And this condition was referred to the divine causality operating in a certain order of sequence by virtue of the form of development in time. Thomas Aquinas clearly looked upon merit in the strict

sense of the term as the effect of grace, and grace as the effect of predestination. He attributed the differences in disposition of men to a divine arrangement, and considered that a certain Divine preparation of the man while in a state of nature, and previous to a state of grace was necessary as a preparation for grace—*præparatio voluntatis humanæ ad consequendum ipsum gratiæ habitualis donum auxilium gratuitum Dei interius animam moventis.*[1] And he says distinctly,[2] *Gratiæ causa non potest esse actus humanus per modum meriti, sed dispositio naturalis quædam in quantum per actus præparamur ad gratiæ susceptionem.*

Aquinas looked upon the human will as a contingent cause it is true, but he did not regard this as a denial of the doctrine of necessity or as an assertion of free will; for he divided proximate or mediate, or secondary causes into two classes, necessary and contingent, but the contingent causes, he held to be mediate causes only, not original ones. Hence they were as subordinate to the first cause, as necessary causes were, only differing from them in their manner of operation. The doctrine of necessity is that contingency in acts is opposed to their ultimate causation from without, but this was not Aquinas's view. He looked upon contingency simply as a certain mode in which things take place, and volition as such a mode and not a cause in the sense of original cause in the case of actions.[3]

He agreed with Augustine that the reason why grace is rejected is man's own fault—not on the ground of the existence of man's free will, but on account of his disinclination to grace by reason of original sin. He places the rejection in the faulty will of the race, and not the mere choice of the person. The change of man's will from evil to good, he attributed to irresistible grace. The doctrine of irresistible grace is an inseparable part of the system—Grace as assisting and expressive of the idea of a divine influence, exciting, suggesting, and encouraging, but depending on the human will for its intended effects, formed no part of his system. By grace he understood something very different. Yet he at times employed expressions which seem at variance with this unless we keep in mind his idea of the operation of grace. Thus he says, "Freewill is essential to the nature of man, consequently in that person who has the use of freewill, God works no motion unto righteousness without the motion of the man's freewill."[4] Aquinas and his followers understood by grace a power or influence which when received necessarily produced its designed effect. This grace they regarded as neither obtainable or preservable by the freewill or power of man. It was held that the preparation of

[1] 1ma 2dæ Q. 109 A. 6.

[2] vol. viii. De Præd.

[3] See further, Mozley Aug. Doc. of Pred., chap. x.

[4] Homo autem secundum propriam naturam habet, quod fit liberi arbitrii: et ideo, in eo, qui habet usum liberi arbitrii, non fit motio a Deo ad justitiam, absque motu liberi arbitrii. Aquin. Summ. pt i. Qdæ quæst. 143 art 3.

the heart for the reception of grace was a divine work in which God was the mover, and the will the thing moved. A distinction was indeed drawn between operating and co-operating grace—*gratia operans et co-operans*—but this distinction was so guarded as not to let in the idea of an original act of the will. By the distinction all that was meant was that the co-operation was not independent but wholly moved and dictated—the will being moved to action by grace was said to co-operate with grace. They attributed to the will two acts, one interior and the other exterior, the one being the substance of the act, the other its manifestation; the one the real moral act itself, the other that act as expressed in outward form. It was the latter act which they allowed to co-operate with Divine grace. This is practically the view of Augustine, but Aquinas then proceeded to modify its effect, or to guard the consequences which seemed necessarily to follow such a scheme, and this without any substantial difference from the Augustinian doctrine.

The philosophical mind of the Schoolmen engrafted upon the theology of Augustine the Aristotelian doctrine of habits. This they held with the doctrine of grace, maintaining that God imparted goodness in the shape of habit, and the result was the distinction between *habitual* and *actual* grace—*gratia habitualis et actualis*, a distinction which carries us beyond the nature of our present enquiry. We may perhaps remark that in the system of Aquinas, effect could well be given to habitual grace with the freedom of the human will, but in order that the human will should be able to put habitual grace into action, an original and independent act must have been assigned to it, and this is a position which is entirely contrary to the whole scholastic doctrine of grace. The result was that they held that habitual grace was put into operation by actual grace alone. This was the main point—the very pivot of their whole system of grace. Habitual grace could be admitted without difficulty even by the Pelagians, but actual grace was the centre of truth. Were man to use habitual grace by his own power of choice, he would have the merit of his own use of this grace, whereas if this grace be put in action only by another grace, no ground of merit in the man himself can remain.

With Augustine, election on the one hand and reprobation on the other were distinctions between positive good and positive evil. He looked upon the predestination of God of some to one state and others to another state as an inexplicable mystery. Aquinas does not exactly follow him here, but uses language which is rather a modification of this view—reducing the distinction to a difference between higher and lower good. He refers reprobation not simply to the original guilt in human nature, but to a principle of variety in the very constitution of

created things requiring that there should be higher and lower places in the universe, down even to some lowest place of all, which must be occupied. "As created things," says he, "cannot attain to the Divine simplicity, it is necessary that the Divine goodness, which is in itself one and simple, should be represented multiformily in them: and the completeness of the universe requires a difference of grades, some high and others low in it. And on this account God permits evils to take place, lest good should be obstructed by its own abundance, and to preserve this multiformity of grades in the universe. And He deals with the human race as He does with the universe, He represents His goodness with the variety which is necessary to such representation, in the shape of mercy to those whom He spares, of punishment to those whom he reprobates....God willing to shew His wrath, and to make His power known, endured (*i.e.* permitted) with much long suffering the vessels of wrath filled to destruction, that He might make known the riches of His glory on the vessels of mercy, which He had afore prepared for glory; and in a great house there are not only vessels of gold and silver, but also of wood and earth, and some to honour and some to dishonour. But why He has elected these, and reprobated those, there is no reason but the Divine Will, as Augustine says, 'Why He draws this man, and not that do not inquire, if thou wouldst not err.' Just as in natural things, a reason can be assigned, why out of uniform elemental matter one part is put under the form of fire, and another under the form of earth, and so on; but why this or that part of matter is chosen for this or that form none can be, except the arbitrary will of the Creator; and as in the case of a building there is a reason why some stones or other should be put in particular places, but why these and those stones are selected to be put in the places, none—except the arbitrary will of the builder."[1]

As according to Aquinas evil is no part of the universe, a lower or the lowest of places in it is a place of good and not of evil. He held to two moral creations, a higher and a lower one—the natural and the spiritual. Predestination sets apart for a peculiar glory, but exclusion from this special glory involves no positive evil or misery. Aquinas applies his doctrine on this head only to the case of infants dying unbaptised, holding in explanation of Augustine rather than in opposition to him (who regarded such infants as being by nature reprobates and unless relieved by the decree of predestination as subject to eternal punishment) that their punishment was deprivation only, exclusion from the presence of God, this being the true punishment of original sin. "In the other perfections and good qualities which are elementary to human nature those condemned for original sin will sustain no detriment."[2]

[1] Aquinas 1ma Q. 23. A 5.

[2] In aliis autem perfectionibus et bonitatibus quæ naturam humanam consequuntur

It is clear, however, that logically the distinction cannot rest with the case of unbaptised infants, but must have a much wider application. Aquinas in his distinction between the natural man and the spiritual man endeavours to supply a defect which is obvious in the predestination scheme of Augustine. The great doctor had he not felt himself bound to adhere to the opinion of the great bishop would probably have carried out his distinction into more marked results than appear in his works. It will be seen that this is one of the defects common to all the several schemes of predestination which have from age to age been suggested for the consideration and acceptance of God's people—the making two divisions only, the forgetting of the *many mansions* in our Father's house, the overlooking of the *three* parts in the Tabernacle and Temple.

Aquinas considered there were two kinds of happiness,—one proportioned to human nature and to which man may attain by the principle of his own nature, the other above human nature and to which man can attain only by participation in the Divine nature. And as there are two kinds of happiness, so there are two kinds of virtue qualifying respectively for each. One class of moral virtues fitting man for his place in the world, making him a worthy member of the world of God's providence—*secundum quas homo se bene habet in ordine ad res humanas;* another class of theological virtues fitting him for his heavenly citizenship *ad hoc quod sint cives sanctorum et domestici Dei.*[1] The former stand connected with the fitness of the moral nature in itself, the purely human as such; the latter, with the higher fitness superinduced upon man's nature by a supernatural Divine principle—the application of a Divine life to the purely human nature.

This is a distinction obvious to all. There is a kind of goodness which, in contradistinction to another kind, may be said to belong to this world:—the goodness seen in the lives of heathens and atheists. Men may be honest, conscientious, good parents, obedient sons, exemplary husbands, good citizens. They may live good moral lives and conform, by self-denial, to a moral code which they conceive to be right, having regard only to this world and the present state of things. In conforming to the dictates of the conscience they may have to make considerable personal sacrifices. They may indeed love God above all things, as no doubt has been the case with many of the good Pagans, but they

ex suis principiis, nullum detrimentum sustinebunt pro peccato originali damnati. In Lomb. lib. ii., Dist. 33, Q. 2. A. 1. In the Council of Trent, Aquinas's doctrine on this head seems to have been generally received, the Dominicans, however, thought that children dying before baptism remain after the resurrection in a limbo and darkness under the earth, but without fire, while the Franciscans thought they were to remain on earth and in light. Some were of opinion that they would be philosophers busying themselves in natural things, not without that greatest pleasure which happens when curiosity is satisfied by invention.—Paul's *History of the Council of Trent.*

[1] 1ma 2dae Q. 63, A. 4.

love him naturally, not supernaturally. They may, in short, display all the virtues of the natural man.

On the other hand, there is a goodness so far exalted above that which we have mentioned as to seem almost entirely different. It springs from faith which is the gift of God. It proceeds only from supernatural fellowship with God, grounded in a free determination of the Divine will. Aquinas assigns as the source of these two kinds of goodness:—reason and God—the Divine Power, however, operating alike in both instances as the true and original cause. In the first case simply as the first or universal cause in nature, moving the free will of man to natural virtue; in the second case in a special way or by grace moving the same free will to supernatural virtue;[1] "As God," says he, "provides for His natural creatures in such wise that He not only moves them to natural impulses, but even endows them with certain forms and virtues, which are the origin of impulses; so unto those whom he moves to attain eternal and supernatural good He infuses certain supernatural forms or qualities, by means of which they may be sweetly and promptly disposed by Him to attain that good."[2]

Now Augustine's doctrine of Predestination drew no distinction between the final condition of the man whose life was conducted on principles of honesty, justice and reason though not a Christian, and the man who lived in every kind of vice, and acted contrary to the dictates of his own conscience. He admitted no distinction; the well ordered natural life was equally condemned with the ill-ordered natural and spiritual life.[3] There

[1] 1ma 2dae Q. 10, A. 6.

[2] Creaturis autem naturalibus sic providet ut non solum moveat eas ad actus naturales, sed etiam largitur eis formas et virtutes quasdam quæ sunt principia actuum . . . . Multo igitur magis illos quos movet ad consequendum bonum supernaturale æternum infundit aliquas formas, seu qualitates supernaturales, secundum quas suaviter et prompte ab ipso moveantur ad bonum æternum consequendum. 1ma 2dae Q. 110, A. 2.

[3] "The mind of the flesh φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς, by its very nature, limited capacity, and time-ward tendency, is θάνατος, Death. This earthly mind may be of noble calibre, enriched by culture, high toned, virtuous and pure. But if it know not God? What though its correspondences reach to the stars of heaven or grasp the magnitude of time and space? The stars of heaven are not heaven, space is not God. This mind certainly has life, life up to its level. There is no trace of Death. Possibly, too, it carries its deprivation lightly, and up to its level, lives content. We do not picture the possessor of this carnal mind as in any sense a monster. We have said he may be high-toned, virtuous, and pure. The plant is not a monster because it is dead to the voice of the bird; nor is he a monster who is dead to the voice of God. The contention at present simply is that he is *dead* . . . . We have already admitted that he who knows not God may not be a monster; we cannot say he will not be a dwarf. This precisely, and on perfectly natural principles, is what he must be. You can dwarf a soul just as you can dwarf a plant, by depriving it of a full environment. Such a soul for a time may have 'a name to live.' Its character may betray no sign of atrophy. But its very virtue somehow has the pallor of a flower that is grown in darkness, or as the herb which has never seen the sun, no fragrance breathes from its spirit. To morality, possibly, this organism offers the example of an irreproachable life: but to science it is an instance of arrested development: to religion it presents the spectacle of a corpse, a living Death." —Professor Drummond, *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*. The same learned writer in another place, speaking of the essential difference between spiritual beauty

stood eternal happiness on the one side, and eternal misery on the other. Aquinas reduces punishment from its positive to a merely negative and privative sense in certain cases, and this reduction meets some of the difficulties of the Augustinian theory, for his punishment thus reduced amounts simply to a lower reward—a reward valuable and substantial though not of the highest degree of happiness, and this he assigns to those who may have been moral without being spiritual, reasonable without the illumination of the spirit, just and upright in their walk and conversation without faith,—a class of persons of no inconsiderable number and which the doctrine of Augustine would have assigned to eternal punishment.

Calvin's doctrine[1] is hardly distinguishable from Augustine's in its broad outline. He considered that God has eternally fixed the future destiny of every individual of the human race—that He has irrevocably decreed to bestow everlasting life and happiness on some and to consign others to eternal misery, totally irrespective of their merits or demerits. Let him speak for himself, that it may be apparent that his doctrine is not stated in broader terms than he himself stated it. "Predestination we call the eternal decree of God, by which He has determined to Himself what He willed to become of every man. For all men are not created in an equal condition, but eternal life is foreordained to some, eternal damnation to others. . . . That, therefore, which the Scripture clearly shows, we affirm, that God, by an eternal and immutable counsel, once for all appointed those whom He should hereafter will to take into salvation, those moreover whom He should will to devote to destruction. We assert that this counsel, with respect to the elect, was founded in His gratuitous mercy, without any regard to human merit; but that the approach to life is precluded to those whom He assigns to

and moral beauty, says: "It is the distinction between the organic and the inorganic. Moral beauty is the product of the natural man, spiritual beauty of the spiritual man; and these two, according to the law of Biogenesis, are separated from one another by the deepest line known to science. This law is at once the foundation of Biology and of spiritual religion, and the whole fabric of Christianity falls into confusion if we attempt to ignore it."—*On Classification.*

[1] It is a very common error for opponents of the Predestination scheme of Calvin to confound with what they term Calvinism many truths of Christianity; and because Calvinists hold them along with their own peculiar dogmas to condemn all together. We find, not uncommonly, the doctrine of justification by faith alone, and the necessity of Divine grace assigned to the peculiarities of Calvinism. Where two men have been found to agree upon any single point, writers have been too ready to treat them as agreeing upon every other point, at least when such a position has been found to favour their purpose, but this is hardly fair. Because a man holds the doctrine of justification by faith alone, and the necessity of Divine influence, is it fair on this ground to treat him as a Calvinist? Surely these are doctrines held by vast numbers of Christians who would reject the Calvinistic scheme of Predestination—doctrines which would not be denied by Arminius himself. It must be clearly understood that when in this work we refer to Calvinists, we mean those who hold the scheme of Predestination as held by Calvin in the main, and refer the term not to those who may hold views in common with him on other doctrinal points.

damnation by His, just indeed and irreprehensible, but incomprehensible judgment."[1]

The main objection to the supposed decree of Calvin is not so much that Election is referred to the Divine will absolutely; for this is true to the extent that our destinies cannot but spring from that will without any reason other than its inscrutable act. Neither is the objection that the Divine will in appointing the destinies of the creatures ought to be regarded as *guided* or *caused* by what was foreseen in the development of the creatures, but it is that ignoring righteousness, truth and wisdom, he refers us as to the final condition of the creatures to an assertion of the Divine operation *à priori* in the Incomprehensible.

Calvin attempts to take the finite into the region of the Infinite. He fails to appreciate the incomprehensibility of the position of God in reference to his creatures, and attempts to bring His action down to their level. He attempts to make the Divine action in the Incomprehensible the subject of the understanding, and to join together by means of propositions intelligible to our understandings the places and acts of the Creator and of the creature. What is revealed to faith, and for faith's contemplation, he endeavours to make the basis of an intellectual dogma. Calvin admits that his doctrine of Predestination involves "a horrible decree of God." "Horribile quidem decretum fateor" were the precise expressions he himself used when treating of his own favourite idea of irrespective reprobation. "Decretum quidem *horribile* fateor; inficiari tamen nemo poterit, quin præsciverit Deus quem exitum esset habiturus homo, antequam ipsum conderet, et *ideo præsciverit*, quia decreto suo sic ordinarat."[2]

As a learned writer on Christian Dogmatics points out from Calvin's point of view, man has *no history*, so far at least as history includes the idea of a temporal and free life in which what is as yet undecided, will be decided. All *is* decided already, existence, life, destiny,—every individual man, with his distinctive lineaments of character, and outward circumstances,—already have been present before the eye of the Omniscient God, with a necessity as fixed and certain as the paths in which the planets move. And though Christ offers His grace to all, in His work and by the means of grace, and calls all to repentance and conversion, Calvin's doctrine of predestination shows that this is

[1] Prædestinationem vocamus æternum Dei decretum, quo apud se constitutum habuit, quid de unoquoque homine fieri vellet. Non enim pari conditione creantur omnes; sed aliis vita æterna, aliis damnatio æterna, præordinatur. . . . . Quod ergo Scriptura clare ostendit dicimus, æterno et immutabili consilio Deum semel constituisse quos olim semel assumere vellet in salutem, quos rursum exitio devovere. Hoc consilium quoad electos in gratuita ejus misericordia fundatum esse asserimus, nullo humanæ dignitatis respectu; quos vero damnationi addicit, his justo quidem, et irreprehensibili, sed incomprehensibili ipsius judicio, vitæ aditum præcludi.—Inst. lib. iii. cap. 21 §§ 5 and 7.

[2] Inst., lib. iii., cap. 23 § 7.

merely apparent; for in reality Christ is come into the world to fulfil an eternal election,—for the fall and rising again of many,—for the rising again of those who were created for the resurrection, for the fall of them who were created for destruction.[1]

The doctrine of Predestination as enumerated in the Westminster Confession of Faith, which is still the avowed creed of the most important part of the Presbyterian body, appears from the third chapter of that confession entitled "Of God's eternal decrees."

1. God from all eternity did, by the most wise and holy counsel of His own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass; yet so that thereby neither is God the author of sin, nor is violence offered to the will of the creatures, nor is the liberty or contingency of second causes taken away, but rather established.

2. Although God knows whatsoever may or can come to pass upon all supposed conditions, yet hath He not decreed anything, because he foresaw it as future, or as that which would come to pass upon such conditions.

3. By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and Angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained unto everlasting death.

4. These angels and men thus predestinated and foreordained are particularly and unchangeably designed; and their number is so certain and definite, that it cannot be either increased or diminished.

5. Those of mankind that are predestinated unto life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to His eternal and immutable purpose, and the secret counsel and good pleasure of His will, hath chosen in Christ unto everlasting glory, out of His mere free grace and love, without any foresight of faith or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature, as conditions or causes moving Him thereunto; and all to the praise of His glorious grace.

6. As God hath appointed the elect unto glory, so hath He, by the eternal and most free purpose of His will, foreordained all the means thereunto, and therefore they who are elected, being fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ; are effectually called unto faith in Christ by His Spirit working in due season; are justified, adopted, sanctified, and kept by His power through faith unto salvation. Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified, and saved, but the elect only.

7. The rest of mankind, God was pleased according to the unsearchable counsel of His own will, whereby He extendeth or withholdeth mercy as he pleaseth, for the glory of His sovereign power over His creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dis-

[1] Dr. Martensen's Christian Dogmatics, § 208.

honour and wrath for their sin, to the praise of His glorious justice.

8. The doctrine of this high mystery of predestination is to be handled with special prudence and care, that men, attending to the call of God revealed in His word, and yielding obedience thereunto may, from the certainty of their effectual vocation, be assured of their eternal election. So shall this doctrine afford matter of praise, reverence, and admiration of God, and of humility, diligence, and abundant consolation to all that sincerely obey the gospel.

This Confession is often said to be purely Calvinistic, but in some respects it differs from the scheme of Calvin, though as a matter of fact it was framed by men who were mostly strong Calvinists. Calvin ascribed the reprobation of the impenitent not to their sin and obstinate unbelief, and to God's righteous *justice,* but solely to God's Will and Sovereignty. Thus in his Institutes [1] he says, "Therefore if we cannot assign any reason for His bestowing mercy on His people except that such is His pleasure, neither can we have any other ground for His reprobating others but *His own will.*" And again in another place,[2] "Those therefore whom God passes by He reprobates, and that *for no other reason* but because it is *His will* to exclude them from the inheritance which He predestines to His children." Calvin thus places Election and Reprobation on the same footing, making God's sole will and pleasure the cause of both. It will be observed that the Westminster Confession carefully abstains from this, and says of the reprobate that it is "for their sin" that God "ordains them to dishonour and wrath." This is the only practical difference between the two. They agree in assigning as the cause of election God's free sovereign will and pleasure irrespective of faith or works, but while Calvin attributes Reprobation solely to the Will of God, the Confession regards it not in the light of an act of *sovereignty* but of *justice.* Calvin's theory utterly ignores, as we have already observed, the idea of probation—he considered that the determination of God was made altogether irrespective of what the creature might choose or do in the exercise of his free will, attaching to the decrees of God the idea of peremptory enactments by which the will of God was rigidly enforced, and ascribing to them a direct and irresistible influence in bringing to pass the events to which they relate. The Westminster Confession on the other hand views Reprobation in the light of *rejection after probation*—presupposing this to be in God's Predestinating decree and to be the result of foreseen obstinate unbelief, so that it was for this their sin and not from God's mere will that the finally impenitent were "ordained to dishonour and wrath."

[1] Lib. iii. cap. xxii § 11. [2] Inst. lib. iii. cap. xxiii. § 1.

It was a decided improvement on Calvin's scheme—for though it is true that God does no injustice to any if He elects not all, there being no obligation in Him to elect any, it does not follow that He can ordain any to punishment without a prevision of their sin. In not electing any God does not injure the non-elect by permitting them to go without the good which the elect by mercy enjoy, but if the non-elect are also to suffer evil and punishment by reason of their not being elect and irrespective of their deserts, this would be to attribute injustice to God. This Augustine admits;[1] he says "God is good, God is just. He can deliver any without good deserts, because He is good: He cannot damn any one without bad deserts because He is just"; and again,[2] "If God is believed to damn any one not deserving it and guilty of no sin, He is not believed to be a stranger to iniquity."

The Westminster Confession is careful to abstain, but hardly consistently with itself, from making God the author of sin.[3]

[1] Contra Julian lib. iii. chap. 18.

[2] Epistle to Paulinus, 106.

[3] The blasphemy of God being the author of sin was first stated in express terms by Florinus, about the year 180—when it was attacked by Irenœus who wrote a treatise against it. The theory was not brought prominently forward for 1300 years, when it was taken up by the Libertines who thought that whatsoever they did was God's working in them, and therefore that He was the instigator of the wicked actions they committed. In truth they rather taught that there was no sin but that God was the author of it. See Bellarmine *de Statu peccati*. lib. ii., cap. 2. The founders of the sect were Loppinus and Quintinus about the year 1529. Manes the founder of the sect of the Manichæans about the year 273, approached very near to the like blasphemy, but perceiving how thoroughly Florinus had been confuted by Irenœus, he taught that there were two Gods the one good and the other evil, both of like eternity, and he ascribed all good actions to the one and all evil to the other. That the Westminster divines did not in terms admit God to be the author of sin is clear from the following incident which occured during their sitting recorded by Dr. Arrowsmith in his Chain of Principles. "In the year 1645 there was published in London an English book wherein God was expressly made the author of His people's sins, though not without some limitations. The Assembly of Divines then sitting at Westminster took offence at this and made complaint of it to both Houses of Parliament; they both censured the said book to be burnt by the hand of the common hangman; and the Assembly of Divines agreed upon a declaration, *nemine contradicente*, by way of detestation of that abominable and blasphemous opinion which was also published under that title, July 17, 1645, and in which we meet with these expressions among others; but the most vile and blasphemous assertion, whereby God is avowed to be the author of sin, hath hitherto by the general consent of Christian teachers and writers, both ancient and modern, and these as well Papists as Protestants, been not disclaimed only, but even detested and abhorred. Our common adversaries, the Papists, have hitherto only calumniously charged the doctrine of the Reformed Churches with so odious a crime (in the meantime confessing that we do in words deny it, as well as they themselves): now should this book be tolerated, they might insult over us, and publish to the world, that in the Church of England it was openly and impudently maintained that God is the author of sin, than which there is not any one point whereby they labour in their sermons and popular orations to cast a greater odium (though most injuriously) upon the Reformed Churches. We are not for the reverence or estimation of any man's person, to entertain any such opinions as do in the very words of them, asperse the honour and holiness of God, and are by all the Churches of Christ rejected."

So in the Confession's view of Providence we find the following statement, "The almighty power, unsearchable wisdom, and infinite goodness of God so far manifest themselves in His providence that it extendeth itself even to the first fall, and all other sins of angels and men, and that not by a bare permission but such as hath joined with it a most wise and powerful bounding and otherwise ordering and governing of them in a manifold dispensation to His own holy ends; yet so as the sinfulness thereof proceedeth only from the creature and not from God; who, being most holy and righteous, neither is nor can be the author or approver of sin."

The statement of the Westminster Confession has been explained by one of its supporters in this way—Predestination means that God included in His plan of the world every act of every creature, good or bad. Having decreed to create freewill beings, that is, creatures having the power of breaking off, or not breaking off, that state of creaturely dependence of their wills on His holy will, and of union to Himself in which He had formed them, and knowing what each in the exercise of his free will would choose, even though it were the evil, He included it in His plan, and to this extent foreordained it, over-ruling it to subserve His own wise and holy purposes. If in one sense, therefore, He may be considered as the first cause of all, yet is He but the *permissive*, not the *causative* or *originating* author of sin. To make this distinction clearer, let it be observed that no act *in itself* is sinful—that is, no *outward* act, as distinguished from an act of volition. The character of every act depends on the disposition or motives from which it proceeds. The same act may be good or bad according to the intention of the agent. Every act of every creature in truth is in so far executed by God. He it is that lends the power, that nerves the hand, that upholds the will. "In Him we live, and move, and have our being," and we cannot do a single act, good or bad, without Him. Every act of the creature therefore is, in a certain sense, also an act of God—even the most wicked; namely, in as far as He permits it, and gives the power for its performance. But it is wicked only in as far as man's will and intention are concerned; on the part of God, it is good, being permitted only as made to issue in the wisest and best ends. Thus the most heinous exhibition of man's depravity ever perpetrated, the crucifixion of our Lord, was on the part of God the highest manifestation of His love and goodness ever made to the universe, and *as such* was permitted and predestinated by Him. God's free predestination and man's free will both met in one and the same act, "Him being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain."[1] Man, therefore, in as far as his volition and intention are concerned is an *originating* cause or author. He originated sin at first; he originates the resistance to the strivings of God's spirit that would rescue him from sin and renew his nature. The awful power bas been given to him to resist to the uttermost and quench God's spirit, and to reject the counsels of God against his own soul; and God cannot withdraw this power without undoing His own work and destroying man's free agency and responsibility. Election and Reprobation will thus be seen not to be exact contraries. Election originates in the free grace of God. Reprobation originates in the free will of man. To God belongs the whole glory of the salvation of the elect. To man belongs the whole responsibility of the ruin of the Reprobate.[2]

[1] Acts ii. 23. [2] Dr. Forbes's Analytical Commentary on Rom., p. 382.

This is an excellent explanation of the doctrine of the Westminster Confession so far as it goes, but it does not give sufficient force to the assumed decree of God respecting the act. And though we are aware that the upholders then distinguish between the *act* and the *criminality*, this is not satisfactory. They assign the *act* to God and the *criminality* to man; but what does the distinction amount to? It is law which makes the act a sin; acts forbidden by law are sinful, the acts themselves are forbidden by the law, and if committed are sinful. It is true that an act might not be sinful were there no law, but then it is an act which has no criminality. Assume that the law does not exist, the act is naturally good; assume that it does exist then the act itself is bad as being a forbidden act, *not* something in the act which may be criminal. Take the example of the first sin. The eating of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, had there been no law against such, eating would not have been wrong, and no sin would have been committed. It was the act itself, not something in the act which was sinful. It follows, therefore, that if God ordained the act, He ordained an act which was sinful. As Arminius says very truly, "If God efficaciously determines the will to the material of sin, or to wicked objects, although He may be said not to determine the will to will evil under the guise of evil, yet is He constituted the author of sin; because neither does man evil under the guise of evil, nor does the devil solicit to evil under the form of evil, but under the form of something delightful; and yet he is said simply to 'lead into' evil."

Some of Calvin's followers endeavour to avoid making God the author of sin in this way: They argue that vice is to be ascribed to the proximate cause, not to a remoter or supreme one. "All causes," say they, "are either principles or from principles; God is the universal principle of all good, nature the principle of natural things, and rational will the principle of moral things, ἐπαμφοτερίζον, 'inclining equally' to good or evil freely." These three principles carry out, according to them, their actions by their own proper motion and issue, and arrange middle causes each according to its own *ratio*,—God indeed in a Divine mode, nature in a natural, will in an elective mode. God in a Divine mode issues nature, nature issues man in its mode; will in its own and proper mode issues its moral and voluntary actions. But if the will issue the moral action, whether good or evil, it issues it according to its own mode which could not be attributed even to nature itself as a cause, although nature generates will in man; because will (though it be from nature) had been appointed by God the proper and sole principle of moral actions in nature, and if the blame could not be attributed to nature *à fortiori* it could not be attributed to God.

This reasoning is not satisfactory. It removes the point of

difficulty only one stage, besides which it goes too far for the majority of the upholders of Calvin's scheme, as it leaves too much to free will. In actual word both Calvin and Beza, it must be remembered, openly deny that God is the author of sin, but they give such a definition of the origin of sin, and take such a view of the decrees of God as to force one to a different conclusion. Their distinction between "acts and criminality in acts," "necessity and force," "decree and execution," "efficacious and permissive decrees," are unavailing for the removal of the difficulty into which their scheme of Predestination leads them. For the cause of sin must be he who necessitates to sin, whether it be done by acts of influence, external or internal, whether by persuasion, drawing, motion or otherwise which the will necessarily obeys, or by external force, which the will has no power to resist.

When we say that the difficulty is not obviated by drawing a distinction between "efficacious and permissive decrees," we must be understood as referring only to the peculiar mode in which these decrees are explained by those holding Calvinistic views. For by a permissive decree they usually understand a decree agreeing in every particular with the efficacious decree, the one being referred by them to that which is good, the other to that which is evil. They say truly God does not *cause*, but decrees and ordains sin, not by an efficacious but by a permissive decree, thus interpreting permission to be the action of the Divine will by which he withholds from His creature that grace which is necessary for the avoidance of sin. It still leaves God as the author of sin, for he who enacts a law which it is impossible to perform without grace and withholds that grace from him upon whom the law is imposed, is in reality the cause of sin, or rather the cause that the law is not observed: which non-observance cannot then be accounted as sin.

It is necessary to bear this explanation in mind, for it does not follow of necessity that he who permits sin is the author or cause of sin, or that he wills it; for it is quite clear that permission is the sign or result of a relaxed will, and he who wills anything does not *permit* the same thing. Tertullian well distinguishes between what God ordains and what He permits, calling the first *pura voluntas*, and the second *invita voluntas*.[1] There is no doubt that some things happen because God *does* them, and others because He *allows* them to be done, and it is by no means the same thing to will that anything shall happen, and to be unwilling to prevent it from happening. In the former case the first and chief cause is the will of God; in the latter the event is resolved into a second cause affirmatively, and negatively into the Divine permission.

The very first statement of the Westminster Confession, that

[1] De Exhort. Castitatis, cap. 3.

God has ordained *whatsoever comes to pass* is objectionable, however men attempt to explain away its force. "Whatsoever comes to pass," must include moral evil as well as good. As Tertullian says, "If nothing happens but what God wills, God wills the commission of crime: in other words, He wills what He forbids."[1] "Whatsoever comes to pass" must include all the murders, thefts and innumerable crimes which have come to pass since the creation of man. And this really seems to be held by some, and these not the least eminent of the upholders of this Confession of Faith.

Thus Dr. Twisse says, "The almighty power of God extends itself to the first fall and to all other sins of angels and men." It was but what Perkins had systematically taught before. "Take heed," says he, "of the opinion of some Protestants which hold and teach that sundry things come to pass, God only foreseeing them, and no way decreeing them, as namely sin. But to give unto God a bare foreknowledge without a decree is to put upon Him an idle providence which the nature of God will not admit."[2] And again, "Nothing comes to pass without the decree of God, no, not the wicked actions of men, which God not only foreseeth, but decreeth."[3] And Perkins had but followed Calvin, who says, "All men are made guilty of Adam's sin by God's absolute decree alone. Adam, therefore, sinned by this decree alone. God may with as much justice decree man's damnation out of His own will and pleasure as out of His mere will and pleasure decree to involve men in the first sin and their damnation for it."[4] "Every action and motive of everything is so governed by the secret counsel of God that nothing comes to pass but what was ordained by Him."[5] "The wicked sin and perish not by God's permission only, but by His will and appointment."[6] And Calvin had but followed what the generality of mankind have understood to be the teaching of St. Augustine. An Archbishop in this country nearly two centuries before Calvin had said, "The will of God is universally efficacious and invariable and indispensable as a cause. It cannot be impeded, much less can it be defeated and made void by any means whatever;[7] and in plain terms the same writer had declared that "Whatsoever comes to pass, is brought to pass by the providence of God."[8]

The whole system as taught by Calvin and as adopted in the Westminster Confession of faith is objectionable and repugnant to the general tenor of Holy Scripture. It is founded on a mistaken idea of God's nature and attributes, and of His scheme of

[1] De Exhort. Castitatis, c. 2.
[2] Perkins on Rev. iii. 10.
[3] Ibid, on Jude 4.
[4] Calvin, Inst., lib. ii.
[5] Ib., lib. i. cap. xvi. § 3.
[6] Ib., lib. iii. cap. xxiii. §§ 2 and 7.
[7] Nunc autem restat ostendere consequentèr; quod Divina voluntas est universalitèr efficax, insuperabilis, et necessaria in causando; non impedibilis, nec frustrabilis, ullo modo. Bradwardin, De causa Dei, lib. i. cap. 10.
[8] Omnia, quæ eveniunt, à Divinâ Providentiâ evenire. Ibid., cap. xxvii.

moral government. Calvin's system is especially repugnant to those attributes of God's nature by which He regulates all things, His wisdom, justice, and goodness. Scripture teaches us that all good comes from God, that no good is done but by His influence. But with respect to evil it is different. God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth He any man. The same fountain does not send forth at the same time sweet water and bitter, salt water and fresh. All evil originates with the creature—not with God. Sin cannot be included in the Decree or be decreed by the most holy God, and the notion can only have the effect of obliterating the truth of man's responsibility, and of annihilating his guilt.

Specifically the system is repugnant to His *wisdom* in two ways. First, because it represents God as decreeing something for a particular purpose which neither is nor can be good; for how can it be thought to be consistent with His wisdom that He should create beings for eternal perdition? Secondly, because it states that the decree of Predestination including therein the decree of Reprobation is for the manifestation of His glory, but this glory He cannot demonstrate except by an act which is contrary at once to His mercy and His justice. "He foreknows the end of man," says Calvin, "because He has ordained and decreed it."[1] Is it evidence then of wisdom that God pretended to impose upon His creatures laws which he had previously by His decree disabled them from obeying? Is it evidence of wisdom to treat as mere machines, creatures whom He has formed with reasonable souls, and whom He holds answerable for their actions—that by virtue of His decree He should compel the doing of that for which He punishes men hereafter? The answer is:—the Lord by *wisdom* hath founded the earth, and by wisdom He ruleth His creatures which He hath placed therein. The ways of wisdom are not such as are here depicted, but rather as shown by the wise man when he says: "Her ways are ways of pleasantness, and all her paths are peace."[2]

Again, the system is repugnant to God's *justice*, not only in reference to His attributes as a lover of righteousness and hater of iniquity, but also to His desire to render to every man according to his works.

It is opposed to His justice because it affirms that God ordains some to dishonour and wrath to the praise of His glorious justice, —"for their sin" is certainly stated in the Westminster Confession, but since by the same Confession He is asserted to have freely

[1] Inficiari nemo poterit, quin præsciverit Deus, quem exitum esset habiturus homo, antequam ipsum conderet; et ideo præsciverit, quia decreto suo sic ordinarat. Calv., Inst., lib. III., cap. xxiii. § 7. This is agreeable to what Augustine says, "Hoc est ergo prædestinavit; sine dubio enim præscivit, si prædestinavit. *De Dono Persev.*, cap. xviii.

[2] Prov. iii. 17.

and unchangeably ordained whatsoever should come to pass, and fore-ordained all the means of grace unto the elect, and passed by the rest of mankind, He is represented as condemning men for not doing what they never had it in their power to do, as sentencing myriads to everlasting fire, because they have not believed in the name of His only begotten Son, when, if they had believed (according to the Calvinists) that He was their Jesus, their Saviour, they would have believed what was utterly false.

And yet Scripture tells us that "Justice and judgment are the habitation of His throne,"[1] "Just and right is He,"[2] He is "no respector of persons," but "judgeth according to every man's work."[3]

Further the scheme is repugnant also to the *goodness* and *mercy* of God, for it asserts that of Himself and induced to it by nothing external, He wills the greatest evil to some of His creatures, He calls them into being, placing them here for a brief season that they may, on departing, be tormented for ever and ever, and that this he fore-ordained from all eternity. This is not the God revealed in Holy Scripture, who is "gracious and full of compassion, slow to anger, and of great mercy."[4] Consider for one moment these passages, "His tender mercies are over all His works."[5] "The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering and abundant in goodness and truth; keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin;"[6] "Delighting as He does in mercy;"[7] "Stretching out His hands all the day long unto a rebellious people;"[8] "He doth not afflict willingly (from His heart) nor grieve the children of men."[9] How can these passages be reconciled with the doctrine that God has formed millions and millions of immortal creatures for the very purpose of making them for ever miserable? Is it not set forth in Scripture that God willeth not that any, even the wicked, should perish, but that all men everywhere should come to repentance and be saved?[10] "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have everlasting life,"[11] and "God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through Him might be saved. He that believeth in Him is not condemned, but He that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God."[12] St. Paul tells us that God sent His only begotten Son to "taste death for *every man*,[13] to make a sacrifice and oblation upon the cross, which was a full redemption and propitiation for the sins of the whole world." And yet the Calvinists hold that

[1] Ps. lxxxix. 14.
[2] Deut. xxxii. 4.
[3] 1 Pet. i. 17.
[4] Ps. clxv. 8.
[5] Ps. clxv. 9.
[6] Ex. xxxiv. 6—7.
[7] Micah vii. 18.
[8] Is. xxx. 18.
[9] Lam. iii. 33.
[10] 2 Pet. iii. 9; Tit. ii. 4; Acts, xvii. 30; Ezek. xviii. 23; xxxiii. 11.
[11] 2 John iii. 16.
[12] John iii. 17, 18; Acts xiii. 38.
[13] Heb. ii. 9.

the majority of mankind is devoted by God to necessary and irremediable misery. "God intends," say they, "to give saving grace only to a few;"[1] or as Toplady puts it, "God *doth not will* the salvation of reprobates—and the *sole cause* why some are saved and others perish proceeds from His *willing* the salvation of the former, and the perdition of the latter." The founder of the Calvinistic Methodists thus plainly states their view:[2] "Our Lord knew for whom He died. There was an eternal compact between the Father and the Son. A certain number was given Him, as the purchased reward of His obedience and death. For these He prayed, and not for the world; for these, and these only, He is now interceding, and with their salvation He will be fully satisfied."

In order to support these debasing views of the love of God we must alter the blessed words of Holy Writ. The *Gloria in excelsis* must be altered—for the goodwill towards men must be painfully qualified. Instead of the gospel being proclaimed as good tidings of great joy to all people,[3] it would have to be declared to be but bad tidings of great sorrow to by far the greater part of mankind.[4]

[1] Whitefield's Works, vol. iv. 58. [2] Whitefield's Works, vol. iv. 72. [3] Luke ii. 10.

[4] So the whole scheme of the Westminster Confession and the doctrine of Calvin on which it is founded is contrary to the truth and Holiness of God. In Deut. xxxii. 4 we read that God is "a God of truth and without iniquity, just and right is He:" can this possibly be the God of whom Calvin says "God hath two wills, the one outward and revealed, whereby He most tenderly invites sinners to His grace, and most graciously calls them to repentance, seeming as though He were earnestly desirous of their salvation, whereas His other will is inward and secret which is irresistible, and takes effect infallibly, and by this He brings men through ways unavoidable to an estate and course of sin here and then to eternal damnation and punishment hereafter." Calv. on Ezek. xviii. 23. It is stated too in Scripture that God is the rewarder of those who diligently seek Him, Heb. xi. 6. Yet it is said of the Elect that no duties, no obligations, are required of them, no terms, no conditions; neither *ifs* nor *buts*; they *shall* come, and if they themselves *will not*, the Lord will make them willing in the day of His power. Hawker's Prop. against Despair, 16. Further, it is written, "Say not then it is through the Lord that I fell away, for thou oughtest not to do the things which He hateth; say not then He hath caused me to err, for He hath no need of the sinful man." Eccles. xv. 11-12. And "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God; for God cannot be tempted with evil neither tempteth He any man." Jam. i 13. Yet Calvin represents God as preparing men by "crimes" for destruction. Quia perditum Deus volebat, obstinatio cordis divina fuit ad ruinam præparatio. Inst. lib. ii. cap. iv. § 3. Dubium non est, quin utraque præparatio ab arcano Dei consilio pendeat. Comm. in Rom. ix. 22.; and one of his followers states that God has "so absolutely and efficaciously determined the will of every man, that he do no more good than he really does, nor omit more evil than he really omits. Ergo tu fateris istic ingenue, Deum ab æterno efficaciter absoluteque decrevisse, ne quispiam hominum plus boni faciat, quam reipsa facit, aut plus mali omittat, quam reipsa omittit. *Piscat. ad C. Vorstii apologiam Dupl. resp*; Ed. 1618, p. 175. And another, Beza, has affirmed that God has predestinated not only unto damnation, but also unto the causes of it whomsoever He saw meet. Respondeo,—ordine causarum, priusquam illum conderet, de fine, cujus causa illum erat conditurus, ac demum de causis ipsis mediis, per quas ipsas erat ad constitutum finem adducturus, constanter et immoto proposito statuisse. Ex quo consequitur recte et vere dici, omnes reprobos factos esse in Adamo simul eodemque momento, sicut Deus ab æterno constituerat, non tantum vasa, id est homines, sed etiam vasa iræ, id est homines justæ per medias causas in ipsis reprobis hærentes damnationi, per media quidem contingenter sequturæ, ex decreto Dei autem prorsus necessario eventurræ, destinatos. *Beza de Prædest*. Op. vol. iii Ed. 1582, p. 431. And another writer accuses the Almighty not only of permitting sin but "providentially putting persons into such circumstances of temptations as shall cause the persons so tempted actually to turn aside from the path of duty, and to commit sin." Toplady on Predestination, p. 60.

To attribute these views to all those known in these days as Calvinists would not be just; only the necessary effects and consequences of Calvin's own views of Election and Reprobation as expressed by himself and some of his followers are condemned.

The Lutheran doctrine always keeps the universality of the Divine promises strongly in view, although it knows that the merely particular fulfilment is not to be attributed only to the guilt of man; but yet it involuntarily again makes the Divine ordination which is independent of the guilt responsible (*e.g.* in respect of the heathen) for that particularity. But Calvin on the other hand proceeds to impugn the principal title of the promise to universality as possessed of real efficacy—and everything depended on this—the promise was not universal. It was indeed evident that not all were called, even as not all that were called attained to faith. But God had not promised that. God owes nothing to man: as little as the beasts may complain and ask why they were not rather created men so little may the people murmur that He passes by one and chooses others.[1]

The features of the doctrine of Predestination as held by Arminius are far less objectionable. It was more consistent with the nature and attributes of God than that held by Calvin, though somewhat fanciful, and the multiplicity of decrees certainly unnecessary. At the same time it was perhaps more injurious than even Calvin's scheme. While Calvin asserted the power and glory of God at the expense of man, who was viewed not as an end in himself, but only as a means to the glory of God, Arminius looked upon the well-being of man as the supreme end, but, in doing so, made God only a means for man as an end. As Dr. Dorner in his History of Protestant Theology says, "The former (Calvin) indeed would not annihilate man and render him worthless; for if man is a means for the glory of God, still there is properly something gained for God by means of man. Man is thus of some importance for God, especially as Calvinism summons him to make it his work to render himself a means for God in self-sacrifice and devotion to Him. Nay, starting from this point, one might be tempted to say: If the ethical element, which places others before it as an end, is the highest, then Calvinism transfers the highest element, the ethical, from the side of God to that of man (whilst Arminianism places it exclusively on the side of God), since, according to the Calvinists, God is supposed to have made everything only *propter se*, if it were not on the other hand to be confessed that this *propter se* is not to be taken in the egoistic sense, and that, on the contrary, the revelation of the *Misericordia* of God belongs also to the end He has in view, His *Misericordia* including—though this is not developed—man, or, at any rate, a part of mankind, as its end.

[1] Dr. Dorner's Protestant Theology, vol. i. p. 402.

Arminianism, upon its part, thinks indeed of man as the end, but is quite unconcerned as to whether God is not rendered by it a mere means for men, nay, whether man is not thereby robbed of the highest element, of unselfish love to God as his end. At the same time, it is still essentially connected with Calvinism, in as much as it too, in order to preserve the transcendent majesty of God, lays a onesided emphasis upon His supreme sovereignty. Nay, in this point it exceeds Calvinism, for it will not—from which Calvinism differs—consider free Divine sovereignty to be bound to any law in God, so that even the ethical receives a merely accidental position. Not because it is something good in itself is it, according to Arminius, willed by God: but that is good which God in fact wills and commands. The positive matter of fact is the source of the knowledge of what is good. Man is recognized as being in the image of God, not in the sense that he is essentially designed for the same good that God *is*, but for that which God *wills*, but might not have willed. If the ethical in general, the goodness as well as the righteousness of God, seems to be thus placed under His power, and to be in respect of it properly accidental, still it is for the most part only the holiness and righteousness of God amongst His ethical attributes which are thereby affected, for it remains in the view of Arminianism beyond all doubt that man and his well-being must be the end for the goodness of God. Man is designed for happiness, and the will and government of God contemplate this end. Thus it was no longer the glory of God, but the glorification of man, which was the supreme principle. This view was vehemently opposed by Calvinism, and with good right; for this theory, by dissolving the idea of a supreme principle in itself good, and the foundation of obligation, let loose those subjectivities which Calvinism confined and held together by the principle of the glory of God. In addition to this, the end ascribed by Arminianism to God, 'the well-being of the world,' does not disavow a savour of eudæmonism; and accordingly the love of God, which it would fain maintain, is rendered by it an unethical goodness. The reason of this lies in the neglect of the rights of that which is objectively in itself good and holy, in the will of God, as well as of man, *i.e.*, in thrusting into the background the idea of Divine righteousness. It is not the ethical in the world which is, according to Arminianism, the highest goal of the world for God, but the ethical only receives the position of a subservient means of happiness. There was nothing in God to prevent Him from giving other moral laws, if well-being had been thereby attainable; but now that God has given them, they are obligatory. The necessary co-ordination of well-being with morality, the essential destination of his nature for the latter, is not considered even in respect of man, but only the obligation to what God has once positively set up as good.

Thus the power and the ethical nature of God are not wrought into one another; Arminianism has accustomed itself to regard the general weal as the highest good, which may perhaps be connected with its tendency towards the province of politics and law."[1]

Arminius taught:—

1. That the first absolute decree of God concerning the salvation of sinful man, is that by which He decreed to appoint His Son Jesus Christ for a Mediator, Redeemer, Saviour, Priest and King, who might destroy sin by His own death, might by His obedience obtain the salvation which had been lost, and might communicate it by His own virtue.

2. That the second precise and absolute decree of God, is that in which He decreed to receive into favour *those who repent and believe*, and, in Christ, for *His sake*, and through *Him*, to effect the salvation of such penitents and believers as persevered to the end; but to leave in sin and under wrath *all impenitent persons and unbelievers*, and to damn them as aliens from Christ.

3. That the third Divine decree is that by which God decreed to administer *in a sufficient and efficacious manner* the *means* which were necessary for repentance and faith; and to have such administration instituted (1) according to the *Divine Wisdom*, by which God knows what is proper and becoming both to His mercy and His severity, and (2) according to *Divine Justice*, by which He is prepared to adopt whatever His wisdom may prescribe and to put it in execution.

4. That to these succeeds the fourth decree, by which God decreed to save and damn certain particular persons. This decree has its foundation in the foreknowledge of God, by which He knows from all eternity those individuals who *would*, through His preventing grace *believe*, and, through His subsequent grace *would persevere*,—according to the before described administration of those means which are suitable and proper for conversion and faith; and by which foreknowledge He likewise knew those who *would not believe and persevere*.

These views of Predestination are defective in many particulars. They draw no distinction between the several ends of election—no difference between the standing of the redeemed, and the regenerate. They seem to assume that all who believe and persevere have been predestinated to occupy the same position, and they ignore the Church as the election.[2] These views, however,

[1] Vol. 1. p. 417.

[2] In his very first decree Arminius seems to take too low a view of the perfect offering of the Lord Jesus. He by His obedience did not obtain the salvation only which had been lost, He obtained something far higher—He reconciled us to the Father, and by His death, resurrection, and ascension became a quickening spirit. He imparts unto those who are united to Him in Baptism, His Divine life. By virtue of our new birth, our heavenly sonship, we live henceforth and act above all the powers of nature, by a higher principle of life than was given to Adam in Paradise, even by Christ and His Spirit living and acting in us.

will be considered more in detail later on. But it may be well to point out here one cardinal defect. There is in the whole system of Arminius an absence of inward religious spirit, and a failure to grasp the truth that the highest good can only be in the enjoyment of the Divine life, and in living communion with God. The Pelagianising element too is allowed an entrance in the Erastian idea of free-will which is propounded, and the idea of faith falls short of the evangelical notion, being practically resolved into the receiving of the doctrines and commands of positive revelation.

Having now briefly referred to some of the principal views of Predestination, which we do not hold, we propose to refer in general terms to the doctrine of Predestination, which we do hold and which we conceive to be the true doctrine of the Catholic Church, at least so far as such doctrine relates to election. But in this chapter little more can be done than the dealing with Predestination in the abstract and the laying down in a general way of those broad principles upon which is based the scheme of election hereafter set forth. It will be well first to explain what is meant by Predestination *so far as it relates to Election*, and it will clear the ground considerably, if the two several senses in which the word *Election* is used are briefly examined.

Some understand by Election the determination of the Almighty that certain persons shall be brought to the enjoyment of blessings, and not the putting them into the actual possession of these blessings which they say, and say with some degree of truth, is the result of their Election—the accomplishment of the Divine will or decree in regard to them. Such parties hold that the actual separation of the Israelites from the nations of the earth, in order that they might become the depositories of Divine revelation, was not God's election of them. Their election consisted in the *previous purpose* to introduce them into the special position which they subsequently occupied in relation to Himself. So the actual introduction into the Christian Church of those who receive the gospel, they hold, is not their election; this consisting in the previous determination of God, necessarily implied, to admit them to its privileges. The determination is made to be the Election.

On the other hand, there are others who hold Election to be the actual separation of the people of God from the men of the world—the actual bestowment of the blessings upon men which it has been the design and purpose of God from the beginning to bestow. These hold that the actual separation of the Israelites was God's election of them, and that entrance into the Christian Church is likewise God's election of each so entering.

Now, though it is clear that God knew before the foundation of the world such as should believe in Christ Jesus and continue

in the faith, yet He chose no man in Christ Jesus till He *was* in Him. Even assuming a decree, God's *decreeing to act*, is a thing in itself widely different from the *action decreed*—so God's *decree about Election*, is widely different from *His Election*.

Where therefore we refer to *Election*, we mean the act of God in imparting blessings whereby the recipient becomes one of the Elect, and when we refer to the *purpose of God* before the world was, and include the idea of choice, we use the word *Predestination*.

Now the Scripture undoubtedly speaks of a Divine purpose to communicate blessings to some men, and of a remnant—a remnant according to the election of grace who will ultimately enjoy them. This Divine purpose we refer to as Predestination—the result of that Predestination being seen in the Election. In writing to the Ephesians[1], St. Paul says, "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ *according as He hath chosen us in Him, before the foundation of the world.*" Here the Apostle clearly shows that the Ephesians were enjoying blessings to which they had been chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world, in other words, that they were enjoying blessings in consequence of a previous purpose or determination of God that they should thus enjoy them. So in writing to the Thessalonians he says, "Knowing, brethren beloved, your election of God,"[2] and again, "But we are bound to give thanks always to God for you, brethren, beloved of the Lord, because God hath *from the beginning* chosen you to salvation."[3]

It is not that men were chosen in eternity, so much as that the law or decree of God, by virtue whereof men come to be elected in time, is from eternity. For men were not from eternity and in eternity had no being, and can therefore only properly be said to be elected in time.

The 17th article keeps well to the letter of Holy Scripture. It first states the fact of a predestination in the Divine mind very much in the language of St. Paul above in writing to the Ephesians, and then goes on to describe the processes which attend on this predestination. (1) vocation, (2) obedience to vocation through grace, (3) justification, (4) sonship by adoption, (5) conformity to the image of the Lord, (6) a religious life, and (7) finally eternal felicity. "For whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son, that He might be the first-born among many brethren. Moreover, whom He did predestinate, them He also called; and whom He called, them He also justified, and whom He justified, them He also glorified."[4]

For all *practical purposes*, Predestination as revealed to man must be considered as conditional. It is true that all God's

[1] Eph. i. 3–4. [2] 1 Thess. i. 4. [3] 2 Thess. ii. 13. [4] Rom. viii. 29–30.

counsels, purposes, and decrees are in a sense absolute, unchangable and irreversible; for any change, or possibility of change in them, would infer a change or possibility of change in Him who is the unchangeable God. If in a strict sense the Decrees of God were conditional and left contingent upon the happening of something in the creature, the fulfilment of God's purpose would be uncertain and precarious, which would militate against the omniscience and the power of God. All that is meant, therefore, when God's decrees are referred to as *conditional*, is that many of them have affixed to them, so far as we are concerned, certain *conditions* which form an essential part of them.[1]

We find in Holy Scripture that God's government is revealed as a strictly moral government, and it treats men as free and accountable beings, having it in their power to obey or disobey the laws or commandments imposed upon them. Its measures are represented as conditional, varying according to the conduct of the human agents, and not either, on the other hand, proceeding in an unalterable course, determined by a decree antecedent to and irrespective of the actions of its subjects, or as changeable from arbitrary choice in the Deity.

Having wisely ordained to make a world and people it with reasonable and accountable creatures, God necessarily endued such creatures with free will, and He can neither necessitate their action, without depriving them of their free will, nor deprive them of their free will without defeating the revealed counsel of His own mind and spoiling the work of His hands. It was not simply for the display of His power and glory, that man came forth from his Creator's hand, but it was that he might reveal Himself to man, and display also His wisdom and justice in governing accountable creatures, to whom, "without respect of persons," He would render according to their works—"eternal life to those who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory; but tribulation and anguish to them that are contentious and disobedient."

The free agency of man and the conditionality of the Divine covenant are clear when God said to Adam, "Of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat, for in the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." Here was a condition to be performed, and unless man had been able to comply with the Divine command, we cannot suppose it ever would have been given. So in the prophet Jeremiah[2] we read, "At what instant

[1] As Dr. Graves has observed, "They never are exercised so as to produce any result unforseen by divine omniscience, they never disturb the order and consistency of the divine plans, or the perfection of the divine moral government; and in this sense *conditional* decrees are still *really immutable*, as they *attach the result invariably to the condition*, and profess nothing more. It would, however, be perhaps more distinct and less liable to misrepresentation and mistake to speak of the divine decrees not as *mutable* or *immutable*, but rather as *conditional* or *absolute*."—Calvinistic Predestination, note to Dis. v. and vi.

[2] Jer. xviii. 7–10.

I shall speak concerning a nation and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up, and to pull down and to destroy it; if that nation against whom I have pronounced, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them. And at what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to build and to plant it, if it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then will I repent of the good wherewith I said I would benefit them."

Does this not illustrate the truth that men and nations also are free to choose obedience or disobedience, good or evil, free to transgress or repent, unfettered by any decree of absolute Predestination? Does it not prove that the Almighty governs not by arbitrary decrees, but by principles of equitable retribution in which His mercy and love are as fully displayed and manifested as His justice?

This moral rule is seen in the beginning, the first man retaining his condition of happiness so long only as he obeys the command of his God. So the covenant that the Lord made with Noah was thus based, for it is recorded that Noah found grace in the eyes of the Lord, and He said, "with them will I establish my covenant,"[1] "come thou and all thy house into the Ark, *for thee have I seen righteous* before me in this generation."[2]

Again when Abraham was chosen, God tried his obedience and his faith, and finding them acceptable in His sight He promised to "make of him a great nation, and that in him all the families of the earth should be blessed." But it is impossible to suppose that Abraham and his seed were chosen irrespective of the foreknowledge of God in face of such a passage as this: "For I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord to do justice and judgment; that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which He hath spoken of him."[3] Every covenant which God has been pleased to make with His people has been *conditional* in the most express terms, the Divine favour and blessing being continued only so long as man performed his part by fulfilling the condition which God had required of him.

So when the chosen people had come to Sinai, and Moses went up unto God, the Lord called unto him out of the mountain, saying, "Thus shalt thou say to the house of Jacob, and tell the children of Israel, ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians and how I bare you on eagles' wings and brought you unto myself. Now, therefore, *if* ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep My covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto Me above all people, for all the earth is Mine, and ye shall be unto Me a kingdom of priests and an holy nation.[4]

So on renewing the covenant immediately before entrance to

[1] Gen. vi. 18. [2] Gen. vii. 1. [3] Gen. xviii. 19. [4] Exod. xix. 3-6.

the promised land, "See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil; in that I command thee this day to love the Lord thy God, to walk in His ways, and to keep His commandments, and His statutes, and His judgments, that thou mayest live and multiply; and the Lord thy God shall bless thee in the land whither thou goest to possess it. *But if thine heart turn away*, so that thou wilt not hear, but shalt be drawn away, and worship other gods, and serve them; I denounce unto you this day, that ye shall surely perish, and that ye shall not prolong your days upon this land, whither thou passest over Jordan to go to possess it. I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing; therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live, that thou mayest love the Lord thy God, and that thou mayest cleave unto Him, for He is thy life and the length of thy days, that thou mayest dwell in the land which the Lord sware unto thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, to give them." [1]

What can more plainly demonstrate the fact that the chosen people were free in the exercise of their will—they might choose life or death, blessing or cursing? What can show more clearly that God's fulfilment of His promises to them was conditional upon their observance of the laws and commandments He had imposed upon them?

The general principle of God's dealings with His reasonable creatures is well shown in the case of Nineveh. The wickedness of that mighty city had come up before God, and he accordingly sent the prophet Jonah to denounce its doom. "Yet forty days and Nineveh shall be overthrown." [2] Still we find that God repented and did not the evil He said He would. "For the people of Nineveh believed God, and proclaimed a fast, and put on sackcloth, from the greatest of them even to the least of them. For word came unto the King of Nineveh, and he arose from his throne, and he laid his robe from him, and covered him with sackcloth, and sat in ashes. And he caused it to be proclaimed and published through Ninevah by the decree of the King and his nobles, saying, 'Let neither man nor beast, herd nor flock, taste any thing, let them not feed nor drink water, but let man and beast be covered with sackcloth, and cry mightily unto God; yea, let them turn every one from his evil way, and from the violence that is in their hands. Who can tell if God will turn and repent, and turn away from His fierce anger, and we perish not? And God saw their works, that they turned from their evil way; and God repented of the evil that He had said that He would do unto them, and He did it not." [3]

[1] Deut. xxx. 15–20. [2] Jonah iii. 4.

[3] Jonah iii. 5–10. "In truth" says Dr. Graves (Cal. Pred., Dis. v.), "the entire series of the Divine promises and denunciations, as well as the history of the favours granted to the Jewish nation, and the judgments executed upon them is utterly irrecon-

There is a like instance in 1 Sam. ii. 30: "Wherefore the Lord God of Israel saith, I said indeed," *i.e.*, I purposed or determined "that thy house, and the house of thy father shall walk before me for ever. But now the Lord saith, be it far from me; for them that honour me I will honour, and they that despise me shall be lightly esteemed." The purpose of God for vesting the priesthood permanently in Eli's house was absolute, not alterable or changeable, but it was nevertheless hypothetical and conditional, contingent upon Eli and his house remaining faithful and observant of the law and commandments of their God.

So Samuel speaks to Saul, "Thou hast done foolishly, thou hast not kept the commandments of the Lord thy God which He commanded thee; for now would the Lord have established thy kingdom upon Israel for ever; but now thy kingdom shall not continue." [1]

He shows that the Lord had purposed to have established the kingdom of Saul for ever in case he and his posterity had walked obediently before Him.

In the same way God's purpose of preserving the lives of all that were with Paul in the ship is expressed in positive and absolute terms, "and lo, God hath given thee all them that sail with thee," [2] yet it is quite clear that a condition was implied, namely, the continuance of the mariners in the ship until the rest had the opportunity of escape, for the apostle says, "except these abide in the ship ye cannot be saved." So the apostle exhorts those in the ship after long abstinence to take meat, and for this reason, *τοῦτο γὰρ πρὸς τῆς ὑμετέρας σωτηρίας ὑπάρχει*, *i.e.*, for this is for your preservation or safety. This plainly shows that notwithstanding the promise made to Paul, that there should not a hair of any of them fall to the ground, they yet might have perished had they not taken the ordinary means of preserving their lives.

We find the teaching of the New Testament equally distinct and definite with the Old Testament in proving the conditional character of the Divine promises. Our Lord's lament over Jerusalem, "Jerusalem which killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee; how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings, and ye would not!" [3] Is this consistent with an antecedent decree preordaining the conduct of the Jews? Does it not rather show that at every step of their progress the chosen people had the power of choosing good or evil, and that their yielding to the chains of the latter was not the result of any previous decrees,

cilable with the idea of *unconditional* decrees, or of the fate of men collectively or individually being fixed before they were born, and unalterable by any exertions in their power. On the contrary, nothing is more clear than the *conditionality* of the Divine dispensations respecting them, the favour of God being granted to them on the condition of their obedience, forfeited by their transgression, and restored again on their repentance."

[1] 1 Sam. xiii. 13. [2] Acts xxvii. 24–31. [3] Luke xiii. 34.

but of their own wilful obstinacy, and notwithstanding the long-suffering and the warnings of God? Is it not a natural inference too, from the words above, that had the Jews submitted themselves to the Divine influence, and harkened to the warnings God had sent them—had Israel harkened to the voice of her God and walked in His ways, the Divine conduct would have been altered respecting them? Their great punishment came upon them, for they knew not the time of their visitation. It was not the result of an antecedent decree passed irrespective of their conduct, but the result of their voluntary and persistent obstinacy. It is expressly attributed to this cause by our Lord Himself. He describes them as those "which killed the prophets and stoned those who were sent unto them," and as those who refused to respond to the gracious desire of their God.

The *conditional* character of the promises of God are as evident under the New Testament as the Old, and the very form in which the Gospel was at first to be declared to and accepted by any human being, proves not only that its acceptance must be in the free choice of the individual, but that if he would continue to enjoy the blessings into the mystery of which he has been introduced, he must comply with the terms of the new covenant. "All power," said our Blessed Lord, "is given unto Me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and lo I am with you always, even to the end of the world."[1] "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned."[2]

Again to the young man who came to Jesus saying, "Good Master, what shall I do that I may attain eternal life?"[3] Did our Lord say, "By a decree of the Almighty from before the foundation of the world you are inevitably saved or lost?" No! He put before him a *condition*, the compliance with which was not only possible but necessary to his acceptance with God. "If thou wilt be perfect go and sell that thou hast, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven, and come and follow me."[4] Can it be doubted that this young man who "went away sorrowful, for he had great possessions," could have complied with the condition set before him, and have attained to the position he desired?

So too in the instructions of our Lord to His disciples, "Into whatsoever city or town ye shall enter, enquire who in it is worthy, and there abide till ye go thence. . . . And if the house be

[1] Matt. xxviii. 18. [2] Mark xvi. 16.

[3] Mark x. 17. Our Lord promised His twelve apostles, Judas being yet one of them, that in the regeneration they should sit on twelve thrones and judge the twelve tribes of Israel (Matt. xix. 28), this was evidently conditional on their remaining faithful unto the end.

[4] Matt. xix. 21.

worthy, let your peace come upon it, but if it be not worthy, let your peace return to you. And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words, when ye depart out of that house or city shake off the dust of your feet. Verily, I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrha in the day of judgment, than for that city."[1] Does this not show that the acceptance or rejection of the Gospel depended not on some absolute decree of Predestination, but on the use the hearers made of the glad tidings declared to them, and for which they were morally responsible? Instances might be multiplied almost to any extent. Only consider the case of Martha and Mary, the account of Ananias, and Sapphira, and Simon Magus, and it will be placed beyond doubt that the offers of salvation to men are conditional, requiring the concurrence of the free choice of the individual, and that it is only as he yields himself to the operation of the Holy Spirit and submits his will to the revealed will of God that he can be accepted, and on the other hand that it is by his wilfully closing his ears and hardening his heart to the word ('the entrance whereof giveth light'), and to the grace offered, that he is numbered among the obstinate and impenitent.

So in the Epistle to the Romans, in that very epistle in which St. Paul is supposed to teach the doctrine of absolute predestination, the conditionality of God's dealings with men is most clearly revealed. The apostle says,[2] "Boast not against the branches; but if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee. Thou wilt say then, the branches were broken off, that I might be grafted in. Well, *because of unbelief they were broken off*, and thou standest by faith. Be not high-minded but fear, for if God spared not the natural branches, *take heed lest He also spare not thee.* Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God; on them which fell, severity; but towards thee goodness, *if thou continue in His goodness; otherwise thou also shalt be cut off;* and they also, if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be grafted in, for God is able to graft them in again."

Before leaving the subject of Predestination we would wish to point out how the doctrine, as held by some together with moral necessity, is destructive of the true Christian character.

The Christian is taught in Holy Scripture that he is placed here in this world in a condition of probation—of preparation for a future everlasting existence—that every individual is under the control of a moral government, in which the dispensations of God are conditionally influenced by the right or wrong of each. He is taught that here he will be beset by trials and temptations which he must endure with patience and quell with self-negation,—that he is a free agent, free to choose good or evil under certain limi-

[1] Matt. x. 11–15. [2] Rom. xi. 18–23.

tations, and that only those shall be crowned who strive faithfully, and endure steadfastly unto the end. That though our Lord died for all, all will not be saved, though all might be; that although Christ is the author of a "day of salvation" to all, yet He is the "author of eternal salvation" to none but such as obey Him by "working out their salvation" while it is day. He is taught to depend on God, and look to Him for grace and strength at every stage of life's journey. When we examine the whole series of the Divine dealings, even those with the angelic creation so far as we can gather from revelation, we find it to be the uniform scheme of the Supreme Moral Governor to subject all reasonable and accountable creatures to trials, and to keep them for a time in a state of probation. No doubt a state of trial is expedient for every finite creature as tending to lead and guide to practical faith, and thus secure the preservation of rectitude. Little by little, step by step, are they led on by the providence of God, from strength to strength, till each may appear in Zion before Him. And it seems certain that there is a necessary connection in the Divine economy between the endurance of trial and the attainment of the Divine approbation;[1] "whom the Lord loveth He chasteneth, and scourgeth every one whom He receiveth."[2]

All the warnings and exhortations in Holy Scripture are addressed to all men as in this condition, and presuppose that each individual has it in his power and will either to obstinately harden his heart against them, or to accept of the grace which is offered with the call that is made upon him, and avail himself of the blessings freely given.[3] So that he who rejects the call, disregards the warnings and exhortations, does so in the exercise of his own free will, and is condemned by his own fault, while he who harkens unto the call, and accepts of the assisting grace of God has nothing to boast of, but must admit that all comes from above.

[1] "Even Jesus Christ Himself, however intimately He was united with the fulness of the Godhead, in whom 'we beheld the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth' (John i. 14); yet as He appeared in human nature, He partook in this particular, also of the circumstances of the human lot. 'He was despised and rejected of men, a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief' (Isa. liii. 3). He was tried by the subtlety of the tempter in the commencement of His ministry (Matt. iv.), and by the 'contradiction of sinners against Himself,' during its entire continuance (Heb. xii. 3). He endured a sorrow and 'heaviness even unto death' (Matt. xxvi. 38), a mental agony which wrung drops of blood from His agitated frame, and burst forth in the thrice repeated supplication, 'Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me' (Matt. xxvi. 39). And all this, as it proved, so it must have greatly enhanced the magnanimity of that resignation which, though groaning under sufferings thus severe, immediately added, 'nevertheless, not My will, but Thine be done.' Still further, when hanging on the cross, the mysterious sufferings of His soul were manifested by the exclamation, 'My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?' (Matt. xxxvii. 46); before we perceive their glorious termination in that triumph of filial confidence and love, with which at His last breath He cried, 'Father, into Thy hands I commend My spirit' (Luke xxiii. 46), and thus closed His sufferings and His life. Thus was the author and finisher of our faith 'tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin' (Heb. iv. 15); and for the joy that was set before Him (undoubtedly the joy of 'bringing many sons unto glory' (Heb. ii. 10),) 'endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God.'' Graves, Calvin. Pred. Dis. xii.

[2] Heb. ii. 2–6. [3] Deut. viii. 2.

In every stage of progress men require the assistance of the Spirit of God to excite or direct, and to support them, and this assistance is never denied to any who seek it aright, though it acts not compulsorily or irresistibly.

Were any man forced to act in any particular way by God, the state of probation would be lost, and the counsel of God overturned. He would destroy the work of His hands, and would save him not as a rational creature, but as a brute or a beast. Obedience forced is another way of expressing disobedience. The Lord says, "My son, give me thy heart," which can have no other meaning than—obey me with an unconstrained free will. When God puts men here in a state of probation, willing them to be saved, He wills them to be saved in His own way as men—rational creatures, accountable for the use or abuse of His gifts, and not in their own way of wilful disobedience, or after Calvin's scheme of irresistible grace.

Prayer is one of the duties common to all men wherever a sense of religion is found, and notwithstanding the superstitions, the errors innumerable in the mode and in the substance, the act itself implies belief in the providence of the Deity and that He is not inflexible, and that things are not absolutely so determined as to render any supplication in respect of them fruitless. The Christian may be in his own eyes, and he may be in fact, poor and insignificant, he may exclaim with the psalmist, "I am a worm and no man," yet he is heard of Him who clothes the grass of the field, and numbers the hairs of our heads. He who is the Hearer and Answerer of prayer is able to attend to countless myriads of beings at one and the same time and to satisfy the desire of every human breast; and no being who approaches to the footstool of the Almighty, and there presents his petition in faith, supposes that the world is governed by laws so fixed, by a destiny so assured as that to pray or hope for any modification of it is improper. How can the man who believes that the doom of every individual is irreversibly fixed, and that such is the effect of the foreknowledge or decree of God, approach unto his God with petitions such as should ever be on the lips of the Christian pilgrim? What effect can such an one believe to be produced by prayer? Can he think that 'the prayer of a righteous man' can prevail against a destiny so fixed, or a decree already issued? It is not forgotten that the reply made to this is, that prayer is one of the ordained means by which the decree is brought into execution, but can a metaphysical distinction of this kind give energy to supplication or fervency to devotion, against the habitual belief that the event is predetermined?[1]

[1] Archb. Sumner. The learned Dr. in his *Apostolical Preaching* says, "Can prayer offered under such a conviction be winged with those feelings which the Apostles recommend and inspire? Every prayer of a believer in decrees, if it is not a mere

In concluding our thoughts on Predestination we will follow the example of Archbishop Lawrence, in quoting what he calls the memorable sentiments of Luther on the subject. "Are we, miserable men," he exclaims, "who as yet are incapable of comprehending the rays of God's promises, the glimmerings of His precepts and His works, although confirmed by words and miracles, are we, infirm and impure as we are, eager to comprehend all that is great and glorious in the solar light itself, in the incomprehensible light of a miraculous Godhead? Do we not know that God dwells in splendour inaccessible? And yet do we approach, or rather do we presume to approach it? Are we not aware that His judgments are inscrutable? and yet do we endeavour to scrutinize them? And these things we do, before we are habituated even to the faint lustre of His promises and precepts, with a vision still imperfect, blindly rushing into the majesty of that light, which, secret and unseen, has never been by words or miracles exhibited. What wonder then, if, while we explore its majesty, we are overwhelmed with glory!"[1]

expression of thankfulness, must be either an empty form, as with those Mahometans who are practical predestinarians; or it must be a virtual contradiction of his own belief; and, in truth, it is only because that contradiction is deeply implanted in the principles of our rational nature, that the belief itself is not more extensively mischievous." On this topic Mr. Solly, in his able treatise on "The Will Divine and Human" (p. 14) says: "The human mind is so constituted that the majority cannot comprehend philosophical inquiries. These need not on that account cease to pray, but they must pray in faith only, thanking God if they are allowed to preserve that faith unscathed by a scepticism which they cannot refute. But how much firmer would be their position if they not only had faith, but were able to give a reason for the faith that is in them: if instead of answering the sceptic with the mere subjective fact 'I believe,' they were able to shew why the sceptic should believe also!"

[1] Quid est, quod nos miserrimi homines, qui necdum radios promissionis divinæ per fidem comprehendere, aut scintillas præceptorum Dei per opera (ein funklin von Gottes gebotten und worken) capere possumus, (quæ utraque verbis et miraculis ipse de cœlo confirmavit,) tamen impuri et infirmi rapimur ad comprehendendam *majestatem solaris lucis*, immo *incomprehensibilis* lucis mirabilium Dei? An ignoramus, quod lucem habitat inaccessibilem; et tamen accedimus, immo *præsumamus* accedere? Ignoramus judicia ejus *imperscrutabilia*; et tamen *perscrutari* conamur? Et hæc facimus, antequam radiis promissionis et scintillis præceptorum perfusi et imbuti sumus, (berichter und begossen) cum talpinis oculis irruentes in majestatem lucis istius, quæ nec verbis nec signis demonstretur, immo *occultata* et *non significata* est. (Das nicht mit worten noch Zeichen angeziget, sondern *heimlich im verborgen* bedeutet ist.) Quid mirum, si *obrual nos gloria*, dum *scrutamur majestatem?* Anno 1530. Lutheri Epist. apud Seckend. lib ii. sect. 13 § 43, et apud Aurifab. p. 38, cited Lawrence Bampton Lectures, 4th Ed., 167, note.

Chapter II.

THE SUBJECTS OF ELECTION.

(a) *Generally.*

The doctrine of Election is one of those glorious themes on which the child of God loves to dwell and in which his soul rejoices to revel. Though a deep mystery, he can yet recognise in it a manifestation of the divine wisdom and love. He sees enough to discern the loving hand of an all-powerful Creator—enough to call forth feelings of gratitude and admiration knowing the while that there is much which passes his finite understanding, much of which reason is incapable of offering a satisfactory solution.

Some doctrine of Election, it will be admitted on all hands, is taught in Holy Scripture, and it cannot therefore be a matter of no importance to us what that doctrine is. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, as the Apostle says, and is "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works."[1] And most assuredly the doctrine of Election as taught in Holy Scripture is no exception. It will be found to be most profitable and helpful to those who are now passing through the wilderness of this world on their way to the heavenly mansions.

An attentive reader of Holy Scripture cannot but be struck with the many passages which, without formally stating the doctrine, contain intimations of it. We read of an "elect people." "Except those days should be shortened there should no flesh be saved; but for the *elect's* sake those days shall be shortened";[2] "But for the *elect's* sake, whom He hath chosen, He hath shortened the days";[3] "There shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall shew great signs and wonders: insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very *elect*";[4] "And He shall send His angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together His *elect* from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other;"[5] "And shall not God avenge His own *elect* which cry day and night unto Him, though He bear long with them?"[6] "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's *elect*?"[7] "Put on as the *elect* of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies";[8] "I endure all things for the *elect's* sakes";[9] "An Apostle of Jesus Christ accord-

[1] 2 Tim. iii. 16-17.
[2] Matt. xxiv. 22.
[3] Mark xiii. 20.
[4] Matt. xxiv. 24.—Mark xiii. 22.
[5] Matt. xxiv. 31.—Mark xiii. 27.
[6] Luke xviii. 7.
[7] Rom. viii. 33.
[8] Col. iii. 12.
[9] 2 Tim. ii. 10.

ing to the faith of God's *elect*";[1] "*Elect* according to the foreknowledge of God the Father."[2]

So we read of an *election*: "Even so then at this present time there is a remnant according to the *election* of grace;"[3] "Knowing, brethren, beloved, your *election* of God";[4] "Wherefore the rather brethren, give diligence to make your calling and *election* sure."[5]

Words could not be employed implying more decisively that God has His elect, and that there is an *election*. It is quite true that none of these passages, nor many others of a similar character which might be cited, propound the doctrine of election in a systematic form, but that they enunciate election as a truth of God cannot be denied. When it is said that the angels are sent to gather the *elect*, we must believe and admit that there will be some *elect*; and when the Apostle says, "There is a remnant according to the *election of grace*," equally must we believe and admit that there is an election. It is evident, then, that election of some sort is revealed in Holy Scripture, and we propose now to consider what this election is. It is clear that the election referred to in the passages cited above is the election of God, and if so it must be in perfect accord with the Divine character, and like the moral law, it must be holy, just, and good." "He is the Rock, His work is perfect: for all His ways are judgment: a God of truth and without iniquity, just and right is He."[6]

The election mainly spoken of in Holy Scripture is not an election of individuals as such to certain blessings, but of individuals collectively for the accomplishment of the purposes of the Almighty. The election, however, spoken of is not invariably of this character, for we read occasionally of individuals elected for certain work, or to certain positions. These are, so to speak, exceptional cases, and election is merely to official stations. Thus the prophets, priests and kings of Israel were elected to their respective offices in the Jewish economy: and the Apostles were elected to their peculiar positions in the Christian dispensation.

Now in treating of the subjects of election we shall soon find ourselves in troubled waters and overwhelmed in the waves of confusion unless we at the onset distinguish between three conditions or states not unusually confounded. We find—

1st. God has an election amongst the heathen who never heard the name of Jesus.

2nd. God has an election amongst His ancient people, the Jews.

3rd. God has an election amongst His baptised children.

These are elections known to God alone. We find further that election has certainly two distinct scriptural significations analogous to those borne by "the kingdom of heaven." As this sometimes

[1] Tit. i. 1.
[2] 1 Pet. i. 2.
[3] Rom. xi. 5.
[4] 1 Thess. i. 4.
[5] 2 Peter i. 10.
[6] Deut. xxxii. 4.

signifies the whole body of Christians in this world, and sometimes "the assembly of just men made perfect" in another; so by the elect is sometimes meant all those persons who are numbered among the elect on earth, and sometimes they alone are intended who give all diligence to make their calling and election sure.

The difference between these two phases of election we see very clearly brought out in one of the parables of our Lord. He says:[1] "The kingdom of heaven is like unto a net that was cast into the sea and gathered of every kind; which when it was full they drew to shore, and sat down and gathered the good into vessels, but cast the bad away. So shall it be at the end of the world; the angels shall come forth, and sever the wicked from among the just, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth."

Here two gatherings or selections are referred to as regards the kingdom of heaven. The net cast into the sea of the world first gathered within it fish of every kind, and when it was full it was drawn to shore, and then in the end of the world a second division or selection takes place, not as before between those who are within and those who are without the net, but between those who are within the net and are good and those who are within the net and are bad. The first gathering is of good and bad into the Church; it is an election in this world which, while conferring certain privileges and blessings is yet not absolute election to everlasting life. This is the election we propose now to treat of.

The two great elections spoken of in Scripture (and these are elections of which we are conscious), are—

1st. The Jews—the chosen people—chosen from the nations of the earth; and

2nd. The Christian Church, the congregation of the baptised, chosen from the Jews and the other nations of the earth.

And the election we propose mainly to consider is neither election simply to salvation, which may refer to worthy heathen and faithful and believing Jews, but that highest of all elections—election in Christ to form His mystical Body; an election of which we have a personal cognizance, and which may be profitably dwelt on for a time.

The merits of the death of Christ are universal—every man feels the effect of this—for all men by His death have been reconciled to the Father. The Church is not simply the association of those who have been reconciled to the Father by the death and offering of the only begotten Son, but she is the assembly of those who have been saved by his life—of those who have received the resurrection life of Christ, and have been regenerated. She is, in fact, an election of certain individuals in this world out of all nations, with the object that by the means of grace thus brought

[1] Matt. xiii. 47-50.

to them, and through faith and holiness they may attain to everlasting life and eternal happiness hereafter, being exalted to the very throne of God as the Bride of the Lamb.

It must be clearly understood that we do not consider that all who are not elect in the sense in which we are mainly using the term, are lost or reprobate. This is far from our thoughts. Christ died for all: His precious blood was shed for every man. Myriads are redeemed who never have been and never will be regenerate in the sense in which God's elect in the highest sense are regenerate —made alive with His life—made partakers of His resurrection life, members of His body. As there were three parts in the tabernacle of old, the Most Holy Place, the Holy Place and the Outer Court, so we can clearly distinguish the three several elections of God to three several degrees of glory. All are not elected to the same glory—"In My Father's house are many mansions."[1] "There is one glory of the sun and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars; for one star differeth from another star in glory."[2] There is the bringing forth of fruit thirtyfold, sixtyfold, and an hundredfold.[3] We see the highest election, the Christian Church typified by the Most Holy Place; the elect Jews typified by the Holy Place, and the elect heathen by the Outer Court. As to the *last*, recall the passage, "In every nation he that feareth Him and worketh righteousness is accepted with Him."[4] As to the *second*, recall the passage, "Among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist, notwithstanding he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he."[5] And as to the *first*, recall the final vision of glory in the 21st chapter of Revelation."[6] One talent of true grace at least is given to every man to profit with, and it is saving if not buried by the freewill of the individual in the ground.

The Apostles always refer to the Church collectively as the election; they are ever using the terms "we" and "us," evidently meaning all who are professed and admitted members of the visible church by the ordinance duly appointed for that end. The Apostle Paul refers to the election of the house of Israel collectively as God's peculiar people as a type of the election of the Christian Church, and this he would not have done had not the analogy been a true one, which it would not have been if the election of one was collective and the other individual.

Both were elections specially made by God—bodies chosen in contradistinction to the great mass of unbelievers who have not been so chosen.

[1] John xiv. 2. [2] 1 Cor. xv. 41.
[3] Matt. xiii. 8. See Clement Alex. Strom. lib vi. cap. 14.
[4] Acts x. 35. [5] Matt. xi. 11.
[6] Specially note verse 24, referring to the elect heathen: "And the nations of them that are *saved* shall walk in the light of it (the holy city, New Jerusalem), and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honour into it."

God took out from the nations of the earth a certain family that the true worship of the one God might be preserved, and the grand principles of religious truth and moral duty might be ever kept in remembrance. It was necessary that the knowledge of the true God through the promised Mediator, Christ, should be preserved, and the means of grace and recovery held out universally to those who should be desirous of pardon and reconciliation, and it is quite evident that all definite knowledge both of God and His promised salvation would have been lost in the midst of a wild superstition had not the Lord taken some means for preserving a witness to the truth in the earth. This He did by choosing first Abraham and his family out of the house of Terah and the mass of the apostate Gentiles; next Isaac and his family out of the house of Abraham; and lastly Jacob and his family out of the house of Isaac. By means of the chosen people the great principles of God's moral government, the belief in a future existence and future judgment were rigidly preserved. They were selected by divine wisdom to bear an important position in the series of God's providential dispensations. To them was "committed the oracles of God, to them were given the adoption and the glory and the covenants and the giving of the law and the promises,"[1] and all were placed in a position such as that had they remained faithful and availed themselves of their many privileges each one might have attained a place in the kingdom of God. And we cannot help being struck with the marvellous wisdom which selected for the above objects a people who to this very day retain a marked conservative character and disposition, and hold fast to their worship and traditions with a tenacity truly wonderful.

It will be well to mark that primarily the election of the Jews had reference to religious privileges in this *present life*, not to eternal happiness in the next except so far as they remained faithful. In the numerous passages in which their election is spoken of in the Old Testament there is not the slightest allusion to their being predestinated to happiness in the world to come, and no one can suppose that all the Jews will infallibly attain the eternal salvation. It is true they had greater degrees of moral and religious advantages than others, advantages which, if improved aright, would have led them to possess a higher exaltation in a future world than others who were not possessed of these. But this election implied no security of unconditional salvation, and the exclusion of the rest of mankind certainly supposed no such condemnation to eternal misery as some have vainly imagined. No single Jew was elected to future happiness independently of his own conduct, and no single heathen reprobated to future misery irrespective of his own actions.

The Election of the Jews could not have been an election

[1] Rom. iii. 2.

directly to eternal life, for we know that notwithstanding their high privileges many were rejected and fell away.[1] Nevertheless the title, "God's chosen people," was the property not of a few Israelites who may have remained faithful to their calling, but of all, good and bad collectively, as contradistinguished from the great body of the Gentiles who were not thus chosen. To every one of them the *offer* was made of God's especial blessing, the condition being their conforming to His revealed will, but whether they would conform to His will and walk in His statutes and ordinances was always made by Moses a matter dependent on themselves. "Behold," says he, "I have set before you this day good and evil, blessing and cursing; now, therefore *choose* blessing."

The election of the Jews then was as a nation arbitrary, but it was an election not to blessing absolutely, but to a privilege and advantage;—to the offer and opportunity of obtaining a particular blessing such as was not placed within the reach of other nations. Whether they would accept the offer or draw down God's curse on them by their disobedience rested with themselves.[2]

The majority we know rejected the call of God and were unfaithful. They grew so that their ears were heavy, and their eyes shut; they hardened their hearts more and more against their God until they had by their traditions corrupted His truth, and by their perversity had wandered far into the realms of formality and emptiness. It was in this condition that our Lord found His chosen people when He came on earth. They were walking not in the light which God had given unto them under the law, they had grown satisfied with the shadow and lost the virtue, for they had ceased to look to the substance, and were in consequence unprepared for that greater light which then appeared in their midst. As the Lord said to them, "If ye believe not the writings of Moses how shall ye believe my words?"[3]

Therefore it was He spoke to them in parables, because "They seeing, see not, and hearing, they hear not, neither do they understand; and in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Esaias which saith, "By hearing ye shall hear and shall not understand, and seeing ye shall see and shall not perceive, for this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest at any time they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and should understand with their hearts and should be converted, and I should heal them."[4]

He spoke in parable to them that they might not fall beyond recovery in rejecting the greater light entirely. A part, however, were faithful; there was a remnant who received the Gospel according to the prophecy of Isaiah, "But yet in it shall be a

[1] "They are not all Israel which are of Israel." Rom. ix. 6.
[2] Whateley's Essays on some of the Difficulties in the Writings of St. Paul. Ess. iii.
[3] John v. 47. [4] Matt. xiii. 13-15.

tenth, and it shall return and shall be eaten: as a teil tree and as an oak whose substance (or stock or stem) is in them, when they cast their leaves, so the holy seed shall be the substance thereof."[1] And these are those "To whom it was given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven,"[2] who formed part of the true election —the election in Christ—through whom the blessing of the Jews shall hereafter come, as St. Paul says,[3] "Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for; but the election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded (according as it is written, God hath given them the spirit of slumber—eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear) unto this day."

As it was with the Jews of old so now we find the same words "elect" and "chosen" applied to a collective body of men, to all who are baptised into Christ and made His own children by adoption and grace. This collective body is the Church Universal. In holy baptism we are made members thereof, being personally called and elected in Christ Jesus. Then it is our names are enrolled in heaven and written in the Book of Life, but it is only those who *continue* in the faith of God's elect, as His dear children who will obtain admission to the kingdom of glory, for "there shall in no wise enter into it," says St. John, "anything that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination or maketh a lie; but they which are written in the Lamb's Book of Life."[4]

All men may come unto God. "The Lord is good to all: and His tender mercies are over all His works;"[5] If thou dost well, shalt thou not be accepted?"[6] "Ho, every one that thirsteth come ye to the waters."[7] The blessed sacrifice of the only-begotten of the Father was for *all*, and this is declared and manifested in His assumption of our nature; for He took that nature which is common to all—He took our nature, and in that act lifted all mankind out of the ruins of the fall. We dare not limit the sacrifice to the redemption of certain only. It was sufficient—it was effectual to redeem all. It was made for all flesh, for human nature. Is it not written that Christ "tasted death for *every man*,"[8] and that "God will have *all men* to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth? For there is one God and one Mediator between God and man, the Man Christ Jesus, who gave Himself a ransom *for all* to be testified in due time."[9] This is a truth we learn from our earliest infancy when we declare in the word of the Catechism, He hath "redeemed me *and all mankind*." God therefore willeth the salvation of all, and every individual is called to believe the love of God who so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son for its redemption from the consequences of the fall.

[1] Isa. vi. 13.
[2] Matt. xiii. 11.
[3] Rom. xi. 7.
[4] Rev. xxi. 27.
[5] Psl. cxlv. 9.
[6] Gen. iv. 7.
[7] Isai. ~~iv~~ 55. 1.
[8] Heb. ~~iii~~ 9 — II
[9] 1 Tim. ii. 6.

This is the witness of God which He has testified of His Son, and he that believeth it not makes God a liar.[1] Therefore it is said, "He that believeth on the Son of God is not condemned, but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God."[2] Men are not rejected for their sins, but for refusing to believe in and avail themselves of the pardon brought to them in Christ Jesus. "As many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them which believe on His name, which were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, but of God."[3]

Now it is clear that the doctrine of election as taught in Holy Scripture cannot contradict or be antagonistic to that universal redemption which is also found so clearly revealed in the sacred pages.

We have seen that the elect are those who are gathered into the Church, and this is so because the Church is the Body of Christ, and therefore the elect are those who are members of His Body. They are elected in Him who is *the Elect One.* God thus speaks of Him in Isaiah,[4] "Behold my servant, whom I uphold (or have chosen), *mine elect* in whom my soul delighteth. I have put My spirit upon Him; He shall bring forth judgment unto the Gentiles." And the object of His election is stated to be as follows:—"I the Lord called Thee in righteousness, and will hold Thine hand, and will keep Thee, and give Thee for a covenant of the people for a light to the Gentiles; to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison house."[5] He was elected and chosen from all eternity, because He was always the only begotten and well-beloved of the Father.

He is the Head, and the Church is His mystical Body composed of many members—the election is the Church—the Head and the Body are one, and thus the "fulness of Him that filleth all in all."[6] No one is elected out of Christ—apart from Him—all who are elected are elected *in* Him, made partakers of the grace of election by being united to Christ as branches of the True Vine—as stones truly laid upon that One Living foundation!

All the baptised then are the elect of God, and the Catholic Church is the Election or the Elect Church of God. They are separate from the world, chosen out of the corrupt mass of the entire human race. They undertake to renounce the devil and all his works, the pomps and vanities of this wicked world. They receive the life of Christ in order to their final attainment of everlasting felicity. They are called the saints, and their vocation is to live a life of holiness.

God's predestination is certainly bestowed on every baptised

[1] 1 John v. 10.
[2] John iii. 18.
[3] Ib. i. 13.
[4] Isa. xlii. 1.
[5] Isa. xlii. 7.
[6] Eph. i. 23.

man so far as it may be of force and effect upon him. The fact of God bringing men to baptism—incorporating them into the mystical Body of His Son is synonymous with His choosing them out of all the rest of mankind. This is, as we have already said, the highest form of election—election to form part of the Bride of the Lamb. No nearer relationship could be established than is established betweeen the elect and their God, for they become, in the words of the Apostle, "His own children by adoption." Children! Thus is established the relationship of Father and Son—the highest relationship—the type of all others—the only one existing in the adorable Trinity. Thus God's predestination and election is, in a sense, His pledge of the gift of sufficient grace for His children ever to remain in the fold of Christ's Church.

But this election, high and glorious though it be, does not irreversibly and infallibly assure eternal salvation to any of the baptised; for God employs only moral suasion. He influences men by His Holy Spirit, but does not employ any power which would override the free will of His creatures or do away with their moral responsibility. He uses no irresistible coercion, and consequently the elect may, through their own perversity, finally fall from grace and perish. As St. Jerome says, "A person who is elected, may both be tempted and perish."[1]

God has been pleased to enter into covenant with His people, and the very idea of covenant implies conditions and rejects absolute decrees. A covenant says you shall have such and such a reward if you act in the manner stipulated; absolute decrees say, that it is irreversibly determined by the arbitrary will of God that you shall or shall not be saved without any respect to your conduct.[2]

No doubt election is sometimes spoken of in relation to God's foreknowledge, and it is obvious that the individuals found in Christ throughout all time must be known to God, but it is the Church in Christ to which God specially looks, and of which it is written, "The Lord hath *chosen Zion*, He hath desired it for His habitation. This is my rest for ever, here will I dwell for I have desired it."[3]

The expression, "the number of God's elect," is not uncommon. This has reference not so much to *certain persons* as numbered of God from all eternity and whom He elected to be gathered out of the world unto Christ, as to the *members* which should compose the mystical Body of the Christ of God. These members were predetermined, as the Psalmist says, "Thine eyes did see my substance, yet being imperfect, and in Thy book all my members were

[1] Hierm. Comment. in Ezek. xx. see Herm. Past lib. 1 vis. 2 § 2; Cyprian de unit. eccles. Oper. vol. 1., p. 118.
[2] Tomline's *Refutation of Calvinism*, 226n. [3] Ps. cxxxii. 13-14.

written, which in continuance were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them."[1] Each generation since the death, resurrection and ascension of the Son of Man, and the giving of the Holy Ghost has furnished its number, and the last gathered will fill up the sum. Then the mystery of godliness, God manifest in flesh, will be finished. Eve was created in Adam as was the Church in Christ. She was elect in Him before the foundation of the world. All was known to the Father and purposed according to the determined counsel of His will, when as yet there were none of the members of the mystical Body in existence. God's purpose concerning the Body of Christ is an eternal purpose, and *every member* necessary to the mystical Body was undoubtedly foreknown to God, their number and their place.

Though we are not prepared to admit that the individuals composing the Body are so determined by God as to amount to an election unto faith, yet we cannot doubt but that even these were known unto Him from all eternity. His foreknowledge is as much an attribute as His omnipresence. He foresaw not only the call, but the mode of reception. He knew the end and final result of the call, whether those called would hearken, and if so, whether they would persevere in faith and holiness through every stage of their progress; and therefore they are said to be "called according to His purpose." But His foreknowledge does not affect the faith or obedience of any. It is not the cause of faith or of unbelief in any as we have already endeavoured to show.

The Church and the Elect in Holy Scripture then are synonymous expressions—they are commensurate terms. Even those who oppose the true doctrine of election are forced to acknowledge this, but to avoid the dilemma in which their admission would tend to place them, they start an absurd theory that the Church of the Elect is not the visible Church Catholic, but an invisible Church within the visible, the members of which are known with an absolutely infallible certainty to God alone. In short, that there are two Churches, one visible the other invisible—the one we see may not be the true Church at all—the one we cannot see must be the true Church! An invisible Church is an absurdity, for it is the very essence of a Church to be visible, gathered together, organised. No doubt those who may ultimately form the mystical Body of Christ in a glorified condition will be the true Church, but any attempt for doctrinal purposes to treat those as a distinct body is a limiting the object and purposes of God as revealed in establishing a Church upon earth; a kingdom of grace in which He has placed visible ordinances and means of grace that she may be a true mother to her children. There is truly an invisible part of the Church even now, it is those who have fallen asleep, who rest from their labours and await the resurrection

[1] Ps. cxxxix. 16.

morn, but it is always *one* Church—the one Body of Christ, filled with one spirit—whether part of her members live or sleep. When St. Paul writes to the Ephesians, he says, "God hath chosen *us* and predestinated *us*,"[1] he does not say *some of us*. Writing to the Corinthians[2] he says, "God is faithful by whom ye were called unto the fellowship of His Son Jesus Christ our Lord," he does not say *some of you*, but all. Again he says, "Put on, as the elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies."[3] In writing to the Thessalonians he says, "God from the beginning hath chosen you."[4] He writes to them as the Elect, and as he addresses his Epistles to visible Churches he could not have meant only certain individuals of the Churches to whom he was writing, and who would have to be viewed as apart from their brethren, and as constituting an invisible Church within a visible Church. So St. Peter when writing to the whole body of the Christian strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, speaks of them collectively as being elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father.[5] Such language could not have been properly applied to a limited number of elected ones—to an invisible Church within the pale of the visible. Further we never find in Holy Scripture any one particular set of Christians addressed as the elect in contradistinction to other Christians.

The letter and sense then of Holy Scripture concur in demonstrating that the Church of Christ is a visible body. It includes good and bad. It is like unto a tree—our Lord's own illustration. A vine has many branches, and they are all nourished by the sap which circulates throughout. There may be dead branches, still they are upon one and the self-same tree. Were they as numerous as the sound ones, were they a hundred times as many, they would not form a tree distinct by themselves, neither could the sound branches be regarded as a separate tree. Such is the Scripture parallel to the Church, a living body with branches, some dead, some living; as St. Paul says, "In a great house there are not only vessels of gold and of silver, but also of wood and of earth: and some to honour and some to dishonour."[6] In very truth, the Church consists of bad as well as good, and the contention that bad men cannot be members of a *true church*, and therefore there is a true church distinct from the visible church, cannot hold water. The truth sought after would be more accurately expressed by saying that bad men cannot be *true members* of the Church, and this would meet the case better than the endeavour to make the *visible* church something distinct from the true church. In the instance we quoted above of the tree no man could say a dead branch was not a part of the tree. It is a dead branch of a living tree, not a branch of a dead tree, nor a branch of some other

[1] Eph. i. 4-5.
[2] 1 Cor. i. 9.
[3] Col. iii. 12.
[4] 2 Thess. ii. 13.
[5] 1 Pet. i. 2.
[6] 2 Tim. ii. 20.

tree because it happens to be dead. In like manner, evil men who have been made by their baptism members of the Church—the visible Church—the only true Church, incorporated into Him who is the Living Vine, may become apostate and dead members, but they remain members of a true Church—a living Vine, though they are but dead and worthless members—members which in God's own good time will be lopped off for destruction.

(*b*) *Testimony of the Old Testament.*

It is of considerable importance to bear in mind who were the subjects of election under the Old Dispensation, for it is clear that the election under the Gospel dispensation is the parallel of that; at least such seems to be the force of the Apostle Paul's argument in the ninth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans.

First then as to the subjects of the election under the former Dispensation. In the selection of passages we propose to cite it will be seen that the subjects of election were certain individuals into one body, and that the object is two fold, the holiness and happiness of the elected individuals and the blessing of others, in fact of all the nations of the earth. As St. Cyril of Alexandria says, "The election of the Hebrews is the calling of the Gentiles."[1]

We must remember too the position of those, not Jews, admitted to the privileges of the covenant. There were two sorts of proselytes, one known as the proselytes of justice, the other as proselytes of the gate. The former became complete Jews, and were in all respect united to the Jewish people; the latter did not embrace the Jewish religion, yet were suffered to live among the Jews under certain restrictions. When a man became a proselyte of justice all his males were to be circumcised as well as himself, and all his children were admitted in his right into the Jewish Community, henceforth being regarded as "born in the land," and entitled to all the privileges and immunities of the Jewish people, as well as becoming subject to the whole law.

Gen. xvii. 7, 12, 13.

I will establish my covenant *between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations* for an everlasting covenant to be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee. . . *And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man child in your generations*, he that is born in the house, or bought with money of any stranger, which is not of thy seed. *He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised; and my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant.*

[1] Cyril *contra Julian* lib. iii. p. 110.

Exod. xii. 48.

And when a stranger *shall sojourn with thee, and will keep the passover to the Lord, let all his males be circumcised, and then let him come near and keep it;* and he shall be as one that is born in the land.

Lev. xx. 24, 26.

I have said unto you, ye shall inherit their land, and I will give it unto you to possess it, a land that floweth with milk and honey; I am the Lord your God, which have separated you from other people (*or* the peoples). . . *And* ye shall be holy unto me; *for I the Lord am holy,* and have severed (*or* separated) you from other people (*or* the peoples) that ye should be mine.

Deut. iv. 20, 37.

But the Lord hath taken you and brought you forth out of the iron furnace, even out of Egypt, to be unto Him a people of inheritance, *as ye are this day* (*or* as at this day). . . *And because He loved thy fathers, therefore* He chose their seed *after them and brought thee out in His sight* (*or* with His presence) *with His mighty* (*or* great) *power out of Egypt.*

Deut. vii. 6.

For thou art an holy people *unto the Lord thy God: the Lord thy God hath* chosen thee to be a special (*or* peculiar) people *unto himself, above all people* (*or* peoples) *that are upon the face of the earth.*

Deut. x. 15.

Only the Lord hath a delight in thy fathers to love them, and He chose their seed after them, *even you above all people* (*or* peoples).

Deut. xiv. 2.

For thou art an holy people *unto the Lord thy God, and the Lord hath* chosen thee to be a peculiar people *unto Himself, above all the nations* (*or* all peoples) *that are upon the* [*face of the*] *earth.* See too Deut. xxviii. 1-14.

Deut. xxvi. 18-19.

The Lord hath avouched thee this day to be His peculiar people (*or* a peculiar people unto Himself) *as He hath promised thee, and that thou shouldest keep all His commandments;* and to make thee high above all nations *which He hath made, in praise, and in name, and in honour; and that thou mayest be* an holy people *unto the Lord thy God.*

1 King. iii. 8.

And Thy Servant is in the midst of Thy people which Thou hast chosen, a great people, *that cannot be numbered nor counted for multitude.*

1 Chron. xvi. 13.

O ye seed of Israel *His servant, ye children of Jacob,* His chosen ones.

Psl. xxxiii. 12.

Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord; and the people whom He hath chosen *for His own inheritance.*

Psl. cv. 6.

O ye seed of Abraham *His servant, ye* children of Jacob, His chosen (*or* chosen ones). See Psl. cvi. 5.

Psl. cxxxv. 4.

For the Lord hath chosen Jacob *unto Himself,* and Israel *for His* peculiar treasure.

Prov. xvi. 4.

The Lord hath made all things for Himself (OR everything for its own end), *yea, even the wicked for the day of evil.* [1]

Isai. xli. 8-9.

But thou, Israel, art My servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, *the seed of Abraham My friend. Thou whom I have taken from the ends of the earth,* and called thee *from the chief men* (OR corners) *thereof, and said unto thee, thou art My servant;* I have chosen thee, *and not cast thee away.*

Isai. xliii. 20.

The beast of the field shall honour Me, the dragons and the owls (*or* the jackals and the ostriches) *because I give waters in the wilderness and rivers in the desert to give drink to My people,* My chosen; the people which I have formed for Myself that they might set forth My praise.

[1] Some render this, "God made all things *to answer to themselves,*" or "aptly to refer one to another." He hath made the wicked for the evil day, that is to be the executioner of evil to others, on which account they are in Scripture called God's rod, (Is. x. 5); and said to be a "sword of His." This is Dr. Whitby's interpretation, but it is not quite satisfactory. The nearest approach to the Hebrew is Archbishop Tillotson's rendering, "God hath ordained everything to that which is fit to it, and the wicked hath He ordained to the day of evil," that is, the wisdom of God has fitted one thing to another, punishment to one, the evil day to the evil doer. Indeed the very next verse proves this to be the sense, for it declares, "Every one that is proud in heart is an abomination to the Lord: though hand join in hand he shall not be unpunished." It is not that God has ordained that the wicked shall commit sin and then suffer the punishment which it is ordained he shall meet, but that the wicked who, by the depravity of his own evil heart has done that which is an abomination to the Lord shall certainly meet that punishment which God has appointed for such wickedness; no human power can protect him—"though hand join in hand he shall not be unpunished." It is certain that the passage under consideration could not have the meaning that is frequently attributed to it by Calvinists, for we read in another place, "Thou (O Lord) lovest all things that are and abhorrest nothing that Thou hast made; for neither wouldest Thou have made anything if Thou hadst hated it," (Eccles. xi. 24). The wicked indeed are the work of the Creator's hand, for He gave them those faculties which they have abused. He made them free agents and in the exercise of their free-will they have perverted His gifts and abused His goodness. All things were made to display the glorious attributes of God, and even wicked men whose prosperity and success in this world are so unaccountable teach a lesson to others, and in the end will be found to furnish the strongest proof of the long-suffering of God, and of his power and justice in their ultimate punishment.

Isai. xliv. 1.

Yet now hear, O Jacob My servant, and Israel whom I have chosen.

Isai. xliv. 4.

For Jacob My servant's sake, and Israel Mine elect (*or* My chosen).

Isai. xlv. 6-7.

I am the Lord and there is none else. I form the light and create darkness: *I make peace* and create evil: *I, the Lord, do all these things* (OR I am the Lord that doeth all these things).[1]

Isai. lxv. 9, 15, 22.

I will bring forth a seed out of Jacob, and out of Judah an inheritor of My mountains; and Mine elect (*or* chosen) *shall inherit it; and My servants shall dwell there. . . And ye shall leave your name for a curse unto* My chosen, *for the Lord God shall slay thee, and* (*or* he shall) *call His servants by another name. . . They shall not build and another inhabit, they shall not plant and another eat; for as the days of a tree are* (*or* shall be) *the days of My people,* and Mine elect (*or* My chosen) *shall long enjoy the work of their hands.*

Jer. xxxiii. 24.

Considerest thou not what this people have spoken, saying, The two families which the Lord hath chosen, *He hath* (*even*) *cast them off?*

Ezek. xx. 5.

Thus saith the Lord God: In the day when I chose (*or* did choose) Israel *and lifted up Mine hand unto the seed of the house of Jacob and made Myself known unto them in the land of Egypt when I lifted up Mine hand unto them saying, I am the Lord your God.*

Amos iii. 1, 2.

O children of Israel . . you only have I known *of all the families of the earth.*

[1] We must remember that Jehovah is speaking to Cyrus, whose creed as a Persian was that, while he believed in one only God, the maker of all that is good, he also believed in an anti-god whom he regarded as responsible for all that is evil. The good creative spirit was Ahuramazda, and the evil Ahriman (*Augrô-mainyus*), the latter being independent of the former and his perpetual rival. It was out of respect and reverence for the good spirit that the evil principle was indued with independent power. In the passage under consideration the dualistic hypothesis of two dominant powers working independently and antagonistically is declared to be an erroneous theory, and the one sole supreme ruling power of the Almighty is proclaimed; but certainly not with the idea of teaching, as some suppose, that the reprobation of some men is due to the irrespective decree of Almighty God.

(c) *Testimony of the New Testament.*

It will be seen in the passages we propose to cite from the New Testament that the election there taught is that of individuals called into the pale of the visible Church in order that collectively they may form the mystical Body of Christ. This is mainly seen by comparison of the Christian election with the Jewish, the latter election being shown to be the type of the former. And St. Paul in particular shows that the new election is to be into a society —viz., the Body of the Baptised from the remnant of the Jews and Gentiles generally brought together into the pale of one visible Church. Under this head the various texts which are usually relied upon in opposition to the general scheme of election as before laid down will also be cited and examined.

Matt. xxii. 14.

¶ Πολλοὶ γάρ εἰσι κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί.
For many are called, *but few chosen.*

Here we see *many* are distributed into two divisions, some that are called and not chosen, and others that are called and also chosen, for the few chosen are a part of the many called, so that the whole are under one and the same calling. It is clear from this passage that the difference was not in the calling—some were not called in a more effectual manner than others, but that the difference consisted in the few obeying the calling in coming when others refused. This the whole parable, of which the text is a part, most clearly demonstrates.

The text under consideration is no doubt peculiar, for the called and the elect stand in distinction from one another, whereas usually in the New Testament the two terms go together as descriptive of the same persons and the same conditions.[1]

Bishop Beveridge, a rigid Calvinist in his younger days and more moderate in riper years, in "Thoughts upon our Call and Election,"[2] mentions five reasons why "Many are called but few chosen." He says, "The last reason which our Saviour gives in this parable is, because, of those who are called, and come too at the call, many come not aright, which He signifies by the man that came without his wedding garment; where although He mentions but one man, yet under that one is comprehended all of the same kind, even all such persons as have the Gospel preached to them and so are called and invited to all the graces and privileges proposed in it, all such as profess to believe in Christ, and to expect happiness and salvation from Him, yet will not come up to the terms which He propounds in His Gospel to them, even to

[1] See Rom. i. 6-7; viii. 28; 1 Cor. i. 24; Jude i.; Col. iii. 12; Tit. i. 1; 1 Pet. i. 1-2; ii. 9. See also Bishop Latimer on this text; *Remains*, by Corrie, pp. 205-6.

[2] *Private Thoughts*, 20th edition, 146.

'walk worthy of the vocation wherewith they are called.'[1] And indeed this is the great reason of all, why of so many who are called, there are so few chosen, because there are so few who *do all things which the Gospel requires of them.*"

John xii. 39-40.

Διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἠδύναντο πιστεύειν, ὅτι πάλιν εἶπεν Ἡσαΐας, Τετύφλωκεν αὐτῶν τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς, καὶ ἐπώρωσεν αὐτῶν τὴν καρδίαν ἵνα μὴ ἴδωσι τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς, καὶ νοήσωσι τῇ καρδίᾳ, καὶ στραφῶσι, καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς.

Therefore they could not believe, because that Esaias said again, He hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their heart; *that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with their heart, and should turn again, and I should heal them.*

There are one or two other texts of a similar character, but this is perhaps the one most strongly relied on by those who contend that God has passed a decree of reprobation on some. They say that the rejection of the Gospel even by His own people is to be referred to the Divine decree rather than to the perverseness and hardness of their own hearts. But such reasoning would make the exhortations of our Lord merely vain, and in fact utterly delusory; for seeing the will of Christ was always the same with that of His Father, it would be making the Son of God ask those to "become children of the light" whom He knew His Father had predetermined should ever walk in darkness!

In a few verses preceding those here quoted our Lord exhorts these very persons to "believe in the light that they might be children of light," and it may therefore be taken for granted that He knew very well that His Father had not by any decree made it impossible for them to believe in Him. For any exhortation, as Dr. Whitby justly observes in his "Discourse on the Five Points," to do a thing we know men cannot do must be vain; and he who by it seems to be desirous we should do that which he knows we cannot, must delude us; and if he knows that God has by some antecedent purpose, will or decree resolved to withhold that aid by which alone we can be in a position or have any capacity for doing it, it must also be an exhortation repugnant to the will of God; it being in effect the same to will that any person should not do the thing which he requires, and to will he should not have the means by which alone he can perform it.

The words of the text in St. John have this meaning, "Therefore they could not believe because (that was fulfilled upon them which) Esaias said," or "It had happened to them as he had foretold." There are many examples of such an ellipsis in other parts of Scripture—several in this same Gospel, as chap. ix. 3; xiii. 18; xiv. 31; xv. 25.[2] They *could* not believe because the

[1] Eph. iv. 1.

[2] It has been suggested that it is malice or wickedness, not God which had blinded their hearts. But this can hardly be conceded. "What God *bids* the prophets *do*,"

prophet had foretold this, but the prophet foretold this because God foreknew that this would be. The reason they could not believe was not because thus it was foretold, but because they *would* not believe, the fact was foreseen. If we are forced to refer the act of hardening to God then it was by way of judgment, as hereafter will be explained in the case of Pharaoh.

Acts viii. 20, 21, 22.

τὸ ἀργύριόν σου σὺν σοὶ εἴη εἰς ἀπώλειαν. . . Οὐκ ἔστι σοι μερὶς οὐδὲ κλῆρος ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ· ἡ γὰρ καρδία σου οὐκ ἔστιν εὐθεῖα ἔναντι τοῦ θεοῦ. μετανόησον οὖν ἀπὸ τῆς κακίας σου ταύτης, καὶ δεήθητι τοῦ Κυρίου, εἰ ἄρα ἀφεθήσεταί σοι ἡ ἐπίνοια τῆς καρδίας σου.

Thy money perish with thee. . . Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter: for thy heart is not right before God. Repent therefore of this thy wickedness, and pray the Lord, if perhaps the thought of thy heart may be forgiven thee.

It is clear that St. Peter had no idea of any absolute reprobation even in the case of Simon Magus.

Acts xiii. 48.

Ἀκούοντα δὲ τὰ ἔθνη ἔχαιρον, καὶ ἐδόξαζον τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ· καὶ ἐπίστευσαν ὅσοι ἦσαν τεταγμένοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον·

And as the Gentiles heard this they were glad, and glorified the word of God: and as many as had been ordained to eternal life *believed.*

The word here rendered in the authorised version "ordained," means also "disposed, placed, ordered or ranged," as soldiers in the field of battle. The word occurs in one other place only in the New Testament, in Rom. xiii. 1. "The powers that be have been *τεταγμέναι*, ordained," or placed of God. The context fully explains the meaning of the passage. In the 40th verse St. Paul having called the Jews to believe in Christ warns them lest they be found among the despisers and perish in their unbelief. In verse 46, we are told that these unbelievers "judged themselves unworthy of eternal life," and "put the word" of God's grace "from them." And in verse 48 we are shown that as many as did not obstinately reject the word, or in the expression of verse 46 "put the word from them, and judge themselves unworthy of eternal life" believed. As many as were humble and teachable received the word; for "God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace to the humble." They were humble and God gave them grace which disposed them to receive the preached word. Dean Alford on the word *τεταγμένοι* says, "The meaning of this word must be determined by the context. The Jews had judged themselves unworthy of eternal life: the

says Dean Alford, "is here described as *done*, and by Himself: which is obviously *implied* in the Hebrew text. The reading *ἀντῶν* (Morus) supplied *ὁ λαὸς αὐτος* as the subject of *τετύφ*, and *πεπώρ* (a variant for *ἐπώρωσεν*), is out of the question—as ungrammatical, and inconsistent with the context, which will only allow of *ὁ κύριος* (*i.e.*, Jehovah) as the *subject*.

Gentiles as many as were disposed to eternal life believed. *By whom* so disposed is not *here* declared: nor need the word be in this place further particularised. We know that it is God who worketh in us the will to believe, and that the preparation of the heart is of Him; but to find *in this text* fore-ordination to life asserted, is to force both the word and the context to a meaning which they do not contain. The key to the word here is the comparison of ref. 1 Cor. xvi. 15, *εἰς διακονίαν τοῖς ἁγίοις ἔταξαν ἑαυτούς*, with ref. Rom. xiii. 1, *αἱ οὖσαι (ἐξουσίαι) ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ τεταγμέναι εἰσίν*: in both of which places the *agents* are expressed, whereas here the word is absolute."

Were we to give to this word "ordained" the sense of "predestinated" as held by Calvin, the passage under consideration would prove too much; for it would prove that all those who heard the Apostles and embraced the Gospel must have been finally saved—a position obviously untenable and contrary to experience.

Rom. viii. 28-30.

Οἴδαμεν δὲ ὅτι τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν Θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθόν, τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὖσιν. Ὅτι οὓς προέγνω, καὶ προώρισε συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς. Οὓς δὲ προώρισε, τούτους καὶ ἐκάλεσε· καὶ οὓς ἐκάλεσε, τούτους καὶ ἐδικαίωσεν· οὓς δὲ ἐδικαίωσε, τούτους καὶ ἐδόξασε.

And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are called according to His purpose. *For* whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son, *that He might be the first-born among many brethren. And* whom He did predestinate, them He also called: and whom He called, them He also justified: and whom He justified, them He also glorified.

A striking rendering of the first part of those verses is, "God worketh with them all things together for good to them that love Him," &c. Hammond has a long note on the expression *κατὰ πρόθεσιν*, and quotes Cyril, Clement of Alexandria, and Theophylact as rendering the words "according to *their* purpose," that is, those who love God; and this seems also to have been the rendering of St. Chrysostom, Origen, and Theodoret. The first says, "It is not the calling only, but the purpose of those who are called which works salvation." But in opposition to this rendering Poole quotes the authority of Ambrose, Augustine and Jerome. There can be no doubt that the reference is to God's purpose and St. Paul never uses the word (except in one instance, 2 Tim. iii. 10) but in this sense, see Rom. ix. 11; Eph. i. 11; iii. 11; 2 Tim. i. 9.

The 29th verse begins, "For whom He foreknew." The connective particle *ὅτι*, shows that the words following are introduced as a proof of the preceding words. The Apostle here asserts that it is the purpose of God and Christ to bring many sons

to glory, and that for accomplishing this purpose He calls out of mankind an election—His Church, as He did the Jews of old. Whom He *foreknew*, not by a bare knowledge, but including the sense of foreloved as Erasmus, Grotius, and others properly understand, He also fore-ordained, predestinated, or pre-appointed them to be conformed to the image of His Son. The word "foreknown" has three significations. One is general, importing simply a knowledge of things before they come into existence; the second signification is knowledge accompanied by a decree, for whatever God decrees *shall be*, He necessarily foresees *will be*; the third signification of the word is taken for a knowledge of love and approbation. It is in this last sense that the word is used in the passage under consideration. It is used in this sense also, Rom. xi. 2, "God hath not cast away His people whom He *foreknew*," that is, whom He had loved and chosen. So the Psalmist says, "The Lord *knoweth* the way of the righteous, but the way of the ungodly shall perish," and St. Paul writes to the Corinthians,[1] "If any man love God, the same is known (ἔγνωσται) of Him;" and to the Galatians,[2] "but now after ye have known God," or rather are known of Him. So in Matt. vii. 23, "I never *knew* you."

There has been much controversy over the meaning to be attached to the word 'foreknowledge' used here. Many of the fathers such as St. Jerome, St. Chrysostom, and Theodoret regarded it as expressive of simple prescience, but the sounder view seems to be the one already given. It is used in four other places only in the New Testament, Acts xxvi. 5; Rom. xi. 2; 1 Pet. i. 20; and 2 Pet. iii. 17. In the Acts and 2 Pet. iii. 17, it signifies merely a previous knowledge and refers to men; in 1 Pet. i. 20 it is applied to Christ as having been "fore-ordained" before the foundation of the world; and in Rom. xi. 2 it refers to God who "hath not cast off His people whom He foreknew," and must there certainly be understood as in the passage under consideration, and as coming under the third signification attached to the word above. Origen quotes the passage as an authority for making the free will of man the cause of God's purpose and foreknowledge. "For whom," he asks,[3] "should be called to justification but those God loves? The Apostle shows that the free will of man was the cause of God's purpose and foreknowledge by saying, 'We know that all things work together for good to them that love God, because they that love God are worthy of His co-operation.'" And in his Latin commentary the same father says, "the word 'foreknew' is used to show they were foreknown by God *in quibus sciens quales essent amorem suum Deus affectumque posuisset*, on whom God placed His affection, as knowing what they were."

"Whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate." Foreknowledge and predestination then are clearly two different things,

[1] 1 Cor. viii. 3. [2] Gal. iv. 9. [3] In Ep. ad Rom.

being here distinguished. The one may rather be regarded as a choice of persons, the other the destination of those persons to the blessings for which they are designed. The passage is like the one in the 1st chapter of the Epistle to the Ephesians, where it is stated that predestination is "unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to Himself," so here it is said that the predestinate may "be conformed to the image of His Son," in other words, that the adopted children may be conformed to the image of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth. The image of the Son of God must be stamped upon all the children adopted into the family of God. As the adopted children are made by baptism partakers of the Divine, the resurrection life of the Son of God, so in that sacrament they are created anew in righteousness and true holiness, being born again of water and the Spirit, that as they have borne the image of the earthly—the first Adam, so they might bear the image of the heavenly—the second Adam, the Lord from heaven.

A reason for those whom God foreknew being conformed to the image of His Son is assigned in the 29th verse, namely, that He might be "the first-born among many brethren." One of the objects of His sacrifice, death and resurrection was the bringing of many sons to glory. "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone, but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit."[1] "He is the Head of the body, the Church, who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead, that in all things, He might have the pre-eminence."[2] He is the first-born from the dead, as being raised the first, and being made the first-fruits of them that slept, and by His power they shall be raised to life and immortality.

"Moreover," says the Apostle, "whom He did predestinate them He also called; and whom He called them He also justified; and whom He justified them He also glorified." Here the Apostle describes the method God employs in bringing His adopted sons to glory; (1) by calling them to the faith of Christ, (2) by justifying them upon their embracing the faith, so that there might be no condemnation for those in Christ Jesus, and (3) by rendering them a glorious people by the Holy Spirit given to them, because they being sons should have the earnest of their future glory.

This is God's purpose with them, that they should be a holy nation and a peculiar people to Himself. He calls and elects them unto this end. He justifies them by giving them full remission of sin in the waters of baptism, and having granted them to be partakers of His life, He gives them the spirit of glory and of God to rest upon them, that they may be all glorious within—that they may be conformed to the image of His Son, and viewing with "open face as in a glass the glory of the Lord," "be changed into

[1] John xii. 24. [2] Col. i. 18.

the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord," or more accurately, "even as from the Lord the Spirit."[1]

All, in the passage under consideration, is spoken of as past because He that calleth is the Eternal One with whom time past, present and future are not, but all is accomplished when determined. And not only for this reason is the past employed, but to show that all are received in this life. Of the predestination, the calling and the justification there can be no doubt. They all refer to this life most clearly. It is only as to the word "glorified" that doubts have arisen; but the aorist ἐδόξασεν being used as the other aorists must obviously imply as much completion as they do. It cannot refer to a future glory. It clearly relates to that "Spirit of glory and of God," which St. Peter says resteth upon the elect[2] in this world—a glory already conferred. It is the gift of the Holy Ghost, which is the glory of God. "And now, O Father, *glorify* Thou me with Thine own self—with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was"; "And the *glory* which Thou hast given me *I have given them* that they may be one as we are one."[4]

It is important to bear this in mind, and not confuse the present glory imparted with the future glorification of the Elect in body, soul, and spirit in heaven. Of this latter glory the Apostle speaks when he says "the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the *glory* which shall be revealed in us" or "to usward"[5]; and again "when Christ, who is our life, shall appear then shall we also appear with Him in *glory*."[6] In one sense it is the same glory, for it is the glory now in us as "temples of the Holy Ghost," and as indwelt of God, which shall later extend to our bodies also. For as the Apostle says, "If the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you."[7]

The predestination therefore maintained in the text under consideration is God's purpose of making known the Gospel, and bringing to glory all who would respond to His gracious call. No countenance is given to a doctrine of irrespective and irreversible decrees—but confirmation is discernible of the doctrine of election as already stated to be that revealed in Holy Scripture.

Rom. ix. 7-26, x. 19-21, xi. 1-7.

Οὐ πάντες οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραήλ, οὗτοι Ἰσραήλ· οὐδ' ὅτι εἰσὶ σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ, πάντες τέκνα· ἀλλ' ἐν Ἰσαὰκ κληθήσεταί σοι σπέρμα. τοῦτ' ἔστιν, οὐ τὰ τέκνα τῆς σαρκός, ταῦτα τέκνα τοῦ Θεοῦ· ἀλλὰ τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας λογίζεται εἰς σπέρμα. ἐπαγγελίας γὰρ ὁ λόγος οὗτος, Κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν

[1] 2 Cor. iii. 18.
[2] 1 Pet. iv. 14.
[3] John xvii. 5.
[4] John xvii. 22.
[5] Rom. viii. 18.
[6] Col. iii. 4.
[7] Rom. viii. 11.

τοῦτον ἐλεύσομαι, καὶ ἔσται τῇ Σάῤῥᾳ υἱός. οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλα καὶ Ῥεβέκκα ἐξ ἑνὸς κοίτην ἔχουσα, Ἰσαὰκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν ;—μήπω γὰρ γεννηθέντων, μηδὲ πραξάντων τι ἀγαθὸν ἢ φαῦλον ἵνα ἡ κατ' ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις τοῦ Θεοῦ μένῃ οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦντος, ἐῤῥήθη αὐτῇ ὅτι Ὁ μείζων δουλεύσει τῷ ἐλάσσονι· καθὼς γέγραπται, Τὸν Ἰακὼβ ἠγάπησα, τὸν δὲ Ἠσαῦ ἐμίσησα. Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν ; μὴ ἀδικία παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ ; μὴ γένοιτο. Τῷ γὰρ Μωσῇ λέγει, Ἐλεήσω ὃν ἂν ἐλεῶ, καὶ οἰκτειρήσω ὃν ἂν οἰκτείρω. ἄρα οὖν οὐ τοῦ θέλοντος, οὐδὲ τοῦ τρέχοντος, ἀλλὰ τοῦ ἐλεοῦντος Θεοῦ. λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφὴ τῷ Φαραὼ· ὅτι Εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἐξήγειρά σε, ὅπως ἐνδείξωμαι ἐν σοὶ τὴν δύναμίν μου, καὶ ὅπως διαγγελῇ τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ. ἄρα οὖν ὃν θέλει ἐλεεῖ· ὃν δὲ θέλει σκληρύνει. Ἐρεῖς μοι οὖν, Τί ἔτι μέμφεται ; τῷ γὰρ βουλήματι αὐτοῦ τίς ἀνθέστηκε ; ὦ ἄνθρωτε, μενοῦνγε σὺ τίς εἶ ὁ ἀνταποκρινόμενος τῷ Θεῷ : μὴ ἐρεῖ τὸ πλάσμα τῷ πλάσαντι, Τί με ἐποίησας οὕτως ; ἢ οὐκ ἔχει ἐξουσίαν ὁ κεραμεὺς τοῦ πηλοῦ, ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ φυράματος ποιῆσαι ὃ μὲν εἰς τιμὴν σκεῦος, ὃ δὲ εἰς ἀτιμίαν ; εἰ δὲ θέλων ὁ Θεὸς ἐνδείξασθαι τὴν ὀργὴν καὶ γνωρίσαι τὸ δυνατὸν αὐτοῦ ἤνεγκεν ἐν πολλῇ μακροθυμίᾳ σκεύη ὀργῆς κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν, καὶ ἵνα γνωρίσῃ τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ σκεύη ἐλέους ἃ προητοίμασεν εἰς δόξαν, οὓς καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς οὐ μόνον ἐξ Ἰουδαίων ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐξ ἐθνῶν ; ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ Ὠσηὲ λέγει, Καλέσω τὸν οὐ λαόν μου λαόν μου, καὶ τὴν οὐκ ἠγαπημένην ἠγαπημένην. καὶ ἔσται, ἐν τῷ τόπῳ οὗ ἐῤῥήθη αὐτοῖς, οὐ λαός μου ὑμεῖς, ἐκεῖ κληθήσονται υἱοὶ Θεοῦ ζῶντος . . . . ἀλλὰ λέγω, μὴ Ἰσραὴλ οὐκ ἔγνω ; πρῶτος Μωσῆς λέγει Ἐγὼ παραζηλώσω ὑμᾶς ἐπ' οὐκ ἔθνει, ἐπὶ ἔθνει ἀσυνέτῳ παροργιῶ ὑμᾶς. Ἡσαΐας δὲ ἀποτολμᾷ, καὶ λέγει, Εὑρέθην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ζητοῦσιν, ἐμφανὴς ἐγενόμην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ἐπερωτῶσι. πρὸς δὲ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ λέγει. Ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν ἐξεπέτασα τὰς χεῖράς μου πρὸς λαὸν ἀπειθοῦντα καὶ ἀντιλέγοντα. Λέγω οὖν, μὴ ἀπώσατο ὁ Θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ; μὴ γένοιτο. καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ Ἰσραηλίτης εἰμὶ, ἐκ σπέρματος Ἀβραάμ, φυλῆς Βενϊαμίν. οὐκ ἀπώσατο ὁ Θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ὃν προέγνω. ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε ἐν Ἠλίᾳ τί λέγει ἡ γραφή ; ὡς ἐντυγχάνει τῷ Θεῷ κατὰ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, Κύριε, τοὺς προφήτας σου ἀπέκτειναν, τὰ θυσιαστήριά σου κατέσκαψαν· κἀγὼ ὑπελείφθην μόνος, καὶ ζητοῦσι τὴν ψυχήν μου. ἀλλὰ τί λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ χρηματισμός ; Κατέλιπον ἐμαυτῷ ἑπτακισχιλίους ἄνδρας, οἵτινες οὐκ ἔκαμψαν γόνυ τῇ Βάαλ. οὕτως οὖν καὶ ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ λεῖμμα κατ' ἐκλογὴν χάριτος γέγονεν. εἰ δὲ χάριτι, οὐκέτι ἐξ ἔργων· ἐπεὶ ἡ χάρις οὐκέτι γίνεται χάρις. τί οὖν ; ὃ ἐπιζητεῖ Ἰσραήλ, τοῦτο οὐκ ἐπέτυχεν· ἡ δὲ ἐκλογὴ ἐπέτυχεν, οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ ἐπωρώθησαν.

They are not all Israel which are of Israel: neither because they are the seed of Abraham are they all children; but, In Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, they which are the children of the flesh, these are not children of God: but the children of the promise are counted for a seed. For this is a word of promise, At this time will I come, and Sarah shall have a son. And not only this; but when Rebecca also had conceived by one, even by our father Isaac; (for the children being not yet born, neither having done anything good or bad, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of Him that calleth;) it was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger. As it is written, Jacob I loved, but Esau I hated. What shall we say then? Is there unrighteousness with God? God forbid. For He saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion. So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that

hath mercy. For the Scripture saith unto Pharaoh, For this very purpose I raised thee up, that I might show My power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth. So then He hath mercy on whom He will, and whom He will He hardeneth. Thou wilt say then unto Me, Why doth He yet find fault? For who resisteth His will? Nay, but O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to Him that formed it, Why didst Thou make me thus? Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour? What if God, willing to shew His wrath, and to make His power known, endured with much long-suffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction: and that He might make known the riches of His glory on the vessels of mercy, which He had afore prepared unto glory, even us whom He also called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles? As He saith also in Hosea I will call them My people, which were not My people: and her beloved which was not beloved. And it shall come to pass, that in the place where it was said unto them, ye are not My people, there shall they be called sons of the living God. . . But I say, Did not Israel know? First Moses saith, I will provoke you to jealousy by them which are no people, by a foolish nation I will anger you. And Esaias is very bold, and saith, I was found of them that sought me not; I was made manifest unto them that asked not after me. But to Israel he saith, All day long I have stretched forth My hands unto a disobedient and gainsaying people. . . . I say then, Did God cast away His people? God forbid. For I also am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin. God did not cast away His people which He foreknew. Or wot ye not what the Scripture saith of Elias? how he maketh intercession to God against Israel, saying, Lord, they kilied Thy prophets, they digged down Thine altars: and I am left alone, and they seek my life. But what saith the answer of God unto him? I reserved to Myself seven thousand men, who did not bow the knee to Baal. Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace. But if by grace, then is it no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. What then? Israel obtained not that which he seeketh for; but the election obtained it, and the rest were hardened.

We have now to consider some of the most important passages in the New Testament touching the subject of Predestination and Election, and have thought it better to deal with the ix., x. and xi. chapters of the Epistle to the Romans together.

Many see in these chapters a predestination of individuals causatively determining beforehand, irrespectively of anything in themselves not only the privileges and opportunities to be afforded to different men, but the use which each is to make of them. The Almighty is supposed to determine and decree the everlasting destiny of His creatures in an arbitrary way—calling into being some men like Jacob with the very object of their enjoying eternal happiness, and others like Esau with the very object of their suffering everlasting punishment. He is supposed to hate some before birth, and before they have done good or evil, reprobating them by a sovereign act without any respect to their faithfulness

or unfaithfulness, their humility or their obstinacy, their worthiness or unworthiness, and all this simply for His own glory.

This is the extreme form of absolute Predestination, or what is known as the supralapsarian doctrine. The sublapsarian view is not quite so harsh, and is thus stated in reference to the case of Jacob and Esau by Mr. Haldane in his Exposition of the Romans: "Jacob was loved before he was born, consequently before he was capable of doing good; and Esau was hated before he was born, consequently before he was capable of doing evil. It may be asked why God hated him before he sinned personally, and human wisdom has proved its folly, by endeavouring to soften the word hated into something less than hatred, but the man who submits like a little child to the word of God, will find no difficulty in seeing in what sense Esau was worthy of the hatred of God before he was born. He sinned in Adam, and consequently was worthy of God's hatred as well as Adam. There is no other view that will ever account for this language, and this treatment of Esau. By nature he was a wicked creature, conceived in sin; although his faculties were not expanded, nor his innate depravity developed, which God who hath mercy on whom He will have mercy, and hardeneth whom He will, and who giveth no account of His matters, did not see good to counteract by His grace as in the case of Jacob, who originally was equally wicked, and by nature like Esau, a child of wrath, and a fit object of hatred." In other words, that the all-merciful Holy God brought Esau into existence as a sinner that he might eternally suffer the punishment of Adam's transgression. Such an interpretation of Scripture must be rejected as inconsistent with the attributes of the Almighty and as degrading to the Being of the Most High.

The case of Esau and Jacob will be examined presently, but it may be well to observe here, notwithstanding Mr. Haldane's opinion of its folly, that many times in Scripture a love of preference is called "love," and an inferior degree of love is comparatively called "hatred." Thus we read, "The Lord saw that Leah was hated." "The Lord hath heard that I was hated." "Now, therefore, my husband will love me," that is, "Jacob will prefer me to Rachel, his barren wife."[1] So our Lord says, "If any man hate not his father and mother and wife and children and brethren and sisters he cannot be my disciple."[2] Now this clearly means that whosoever does not "love his father, mother, wife and children, brethren and sisters" less than our Lord cannot be His disciple. It is quite open to contention that it is by a similar idiom it is said "Esau have I hated"; but there seems to be no necessity for thus endeavouring to evade the full force to the words, and some difficulty indeed in holding it in face of the words in Malachi,[3]

[1] Gen. xxix. 31, 32, 33; see also Deut. xxi. 15.
[2] Luke xiv. 26.
[3] Mal. i. 3, 4.

which do properly appear to require that the ordinary meaning be given to the word ἐμίσησα.

The Election of which the Apostle speaks in the passages under consideration is evidently (so far as it relates to the Jews) of those who embrace the Gospel, "the rest" are those who reject it. "As concerning the Gospel they are enemies for your sakes; but as touching the election they are beloved for their fathers' sakes."[1] Observe the same persons who in the latter clause of this passage are declared to be "beloved as touching the election" are in the former declared to be "enemies as concerning the gospel," and consequently election cannot well mean election of individuals to salvation. This is said of the unbelieving Jews who were "beloved" as belonging to the chosen people of God, and "enemies" because they rejected the Gospel. St. Paul speaks of the twofold election of the Jews, their election to be God's peculiar people under the Mosaic Law and their election under the Gospel dispensation.[2] The latter he calls "the Election of Grace," the former the Election which makes them still "beloved" notwithstanding their unbelief, "for the fathers' sake," on account of their descent from Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. But though in this respect the election of the Jew into the Christian Church had to him the aspect of an individual election, yet the Apostle makes it perfectly clear that the election is, in reality, the election of a body chosen to be the Bride of the Lamb. He used the word *election* according to the association invariably united with it in his own mind and, indeed, in the mind of every devout Jew, and he applies it to those who were thenceforth to be the true "election"—those elected to the highest blessings in the power and ability of God to bestow.

The "election" of the Jew was that a standing testimony might be preserved in the midst of the nations to the promise made to our first parents, and that the attributes of God as revealed to the fathers might be preserved from utter oblivion in the minds of men. The new "election" was to be *the* revelation of God to men —the mystical Body in which, while still at the right hand of the Father, the Lord Jesus would be revealed and work on earth, and by means of which He would bless His chosen people, the Jews, and through them all the nations of the earth throughout all eternity.

This higher *election* was the election to which St. Paul besought his countrymen to join themselves, "I speak to you Gentiles; in-

[1] Rom. xi. 28.

[2] There is, of course, this great difference between the acceptance of the Jew under the Law and the Christian under the Gospel. The former was accepted not only by his faith in the divine promise, but on condition of his fulfilling the works of the Law. The Christian is accepted not in consequence of fulfilling the works of any law, but by the free and unmerited mercy of God granted to faith in Christ alone. We must not, however, lose sight of the truth that even acceptance of the Jew under the law was by virtue of the sacrifice of Christ though to us subsequent in time.

asmuch as I am the Apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify my office: if by any means I may provoke to emulation them which are my flesh and might save some of them."[1] It was most difficult for the Jews to admit that any could be called a "chosen generation, an holy nation, a peculiar people," but themselves, that any could be called into the enjoyment of higher and more exalted privileges than they themselves enjoyed under the law.

For fifteen hundred years the privilege of being the chosen of God had been confined to them, and this accounts for St. Paul, in the two Epistles addressed to those in which the Jewish converts formed so large a proportion—the Romans and the Ephesians—pressing the subject of the choosing and calling of the Gentiles. The Jew from his youth had been accustomed to regard the Gentiles as idolaters, to despise them as indulging in practices abhorrent to his prejudices and to his teaching, and this was one of his main difficulties in accepting the salvation offered by incorporation into the Christian Church. He could not conceive how so many "aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world,"[2] were now brought nigh to the Father by His eternal purpose through the blood of Christ.[3]

It was for declaring the truth of the admission of the Gentiles to the Christian Church without conformity to the Jewish law that the Apostle was imprisoned. It was as he tells the Colossians for declaring the mystery of Christ for which he was in bonds.[4] He tells the Ephesians too that he was "the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles,"[5] and adds, "if so be that ye have heard of the *dispensation of the grace of God* which is given me to youward . . . which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto His holy Apostles and Prophets by the Spirit, that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs and of the same body, and partakers of His promise in Christ by the Gospel."[6]

In the passages under consideration, the Apostle is justifying God's dealings with the unbelieving Jews and the believing Gentiles, in rejecting the former by reason of their hardness of heart, and admitting the latter to the blessings of the Gospel by reason of their faith in and submission to God. Having referred to the principle which proved that the admission of the Gentiles into the Church was consistent with the entire scheme of the Divine dispensation, he proceeds to argue with the Jews that they had no right to complain of another nation being now admitted to the peculiar privileges of the chosen people of God since *they had themselves* enjoyed their privileges merely by an act of unmerited favour on the part of God, as was evident from the history of

[1] Rom. xi. 14.
[2] Eph. ii. 12.
[3] Eph. ii. 13; Eph. iii. 11.
[4] Col. i. 24-27.
[5] Eph. iii. 1.
[6] Eph. iii. 2-6.

Esau and Jacob and their posterity; and that therefore a *similar gratuitous* favour might with strict consistency be extended to the Gentiles by admitting them into the Church of God in place of the Jews, whose unbelief excluded them.[1]

This appears from his recapitulation of his whole discourse in the 30th verse, τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν: "What shall we say then?" that is, What is the substance of what I have said. It is even this, "That the Gentiles which followed not after righteousness have attained to righteousness, . . . but Israel which followed after the law of righteousness hath not attained to the law of righteousness . . . because they sought it not by faith." He laments the unbelief and consequent rejection of his brethren after the flesh to whom "pertained the promises," but he comforts himself with the reflection that a remnant had hearkened unto the preached word, and he shows that the adoption of a remnant, or partial adoption of the Jews in the present instance was similar to the adoption not of all the descendants of Abraham as the chosen people, but only of the descendants of Isaac and Jacob.

The entire disappearance of election as an outward and visible fact from the daily lives of those who live in Christian communities is one main source of the difficulty we experience in following the reasoning of the Apostle. So long as the elect were a small body like the Jews, the fact was obvious, and so while only a small portion of the Gentile world had received the Gospel the fact still remained discernible, but as gradually the whole of the civilised Gentile world became absorbed in the election, so the visible outward fact gradually disappeared. When Paul wrote, the election of the Gentile still visibly appeared as an election, but later, as in our day, when the election of the Gentile seems like the election of the world, it must appear as no election, but only a rejection of the smaller class—the Jews. This point is well stated in an able essay on Election by Mr. Fry, who also shows how the election of the Jews in the time of St. Paul appeared, as it still appears to us, not a personal, but a national election; and the election of England as compared with Africa appears to us now clearly not a personal, but a national election. "In the days of Abraham," says he, (p. 55) "the election of the Jews was, so to speak, personal—it bore, at least, the semblance of the election rather of a person than of a nation: and so in the earlier stages of the Christian Church, as the purpose of God to bring in the Gentiles was gradually unfolding itself by the foundation here and there of little Churches destined thereafter to spread till they absorbed all the heathen elements around them—in that imperfect and transitional stage, the election of the Gentiles, which in its true character and nature was national, bore to the eye some of the qualities of a personal election. It was, in fact, the personal

[1] Graves *Cal. Pred.* Diss. ix.

election of some members of a nation to privileges which nations, as such, may enjoy, and which those nations, in their entirety, were thereafter to enjoy."

The eternal salvation or rejection of any individual is certainly not involved in anything the Apostle says, and we fail to see the ground on which the late Dean of Canterbury based his assertion that we must consent to hold our reason in abeyance, if we do not recognise the inference that the sovereign power and free election proved by the Apostle to belong to God extend to *every exercise* of His mercy, whether temporal or spiritual, whether in providence or in grace, whether national or individual.[1] Because God exercises His national election according to His sovereign will, therefore He will so deal with individuals is a line of argument which hardly seems warranted. May we not rather say the presumption is the other way, and look to the next world to rectify the inequalities of this life by a due consideration of the diversities of outward circumstances and opportunities? and surely the doctrine of individual election cannot be allowed to rest on an inference such as that assumed by Dean Alford. A national election does not stand on the same footing as an individual election. "A nation," says Mr. Fry,[2] "has in this world a life which we may liken to the life of the individual man, and the blessings or the curses that have rested on one generation are handed down to their successors: but in the world to come, a nation cannot, as such, be conceived as having a life. It has not a single consciousness or personal identity which can make it the subject of rewards or punishments. It is then consistent with the notion of a national election or rejection that individuals of an elected nation may be cast out from everlasting life, and individuals of a rejected nation may be admitted into everlasting joy: that the separate circumstances of each person may be weighed, and those who, though being members of a rejected nation, have yet sinned but little, may be beaten with few stripes, whilst those who, though being members of an elected nation, have yet sinned greatly, may be beaten with many. That we may in the notion of a national election conceive—nay, we may and must believe—that in the end and balancing of all things, God will be perfectly just to each individual soul, and the apparent injustice of earthly circumstances be compensated for; whilst on the other hand, the notion of the election of some individuals to eternal life, and the rejection of others therefrom presents to us the awful spectacle of what (speaking as a man) I may call the injustice of the arrangements of earth transferred to the other world, and continued without hope of change through an endless eternity. In short, a merely national election cannot be to everlasting life, but only to certain privileges or advantages in this world: and just as the privileges

[1] Alford's Greek Test. Rom. ix. 16. [2] Election, p. 79.

of one man over another are perfectly inscrutable, and yet create no suspicion or surmise of Divine injustice, so in like manner the advantages of a whole body of men constituting a nation over the men constituting another nation are inscrutable evidences of God's sovereign power, and yet may stand with His claim to be a God of perfect justice."

The illustration of Jacob and Esau was certainly not intended to have a personal and individual application, as Irenæus says, *Partum Rebeccæ prophetiam fuisse duorum populorum*; and, as a matter of fact, Esau never did serve Jacob. In truth, Jacob had to flee from his brother, and when in after years he returned he acted in a very submissive manner. He bowed himself to the ground seven times, and addressed his brother Esau as "my lord." It is true the Edomites became tributaries to David nearly a thousand years after, but this servitude did not long continue, for in Jehoram's time they revolted,[1] and so continued. They were certainly more prosperous than the descendants of Jacob at the time of the Babylonish captivity, and we read of their saying concerning Jerusalem, "Raze it, raze it, even to the foundation thereof."[2]

The words to Rebecca would show that the election spoken of was not personal. "*Two nations* are in thy womb, and *two manner of people* shall be separated from thy bowels and the one people shall be stronger than the other people, and the elder shall serve the younger."[3] This rather implies that election of nations in the present world, and not the election of individuals to eternal life or destruction in a future condition is revealed in this teaching of St. Paul; and it is with reference to this national election that the Apostle maintains that the election did not depend on "any good or evil" the individuals had done, it being "determined before they were born."[4]

The order in which nations receive the Gospel is all in the appointment of God. He appoints the time when and the mode in

[1] 2 Chron. xxi. 10; 2 Kings viii. 22.

[2] Psl. cxxxvii. 7.

[3] Gen. xxv. 23.

[4] That St. Paul is referring to the people of God nationally considered seems clear from the whole argument. He shows that there was no national rejection so far as the Gospel was concerned, as otherwise he, as an Israelite, would have been cut off from God's favour. Dean Alford has pointed out that the covenant of God with Israel having been *national* shall ultimately be fulfilled to them *as a nation;* not by the gathering in merely of individual Jews, or of all the Jews, individuals, into the Christian Church, but by the national restoration of the Jews, not in unbelief but as a believing nation, to the fulness of those promises which have never yet, in their plain sense, been accomplished to them. This is true; but when the learned writer goes on to refer the 2nd verse of the 11th chapter of the Epistle to the Romans to the Jews as the chosen nation, making the remnant according to the election of grace (contrary to the opinion of Origen, Augustine, Chrysostom, and others who refer it to the Elect Christian people from among the Jews), extend to them as a nation, we are unable to follow him, for he seems to commit the very error he attributes to those who hold no restoration of the Jews to pre-eminence (which by the way is a term open to much misconstruction) of confounding the ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ remnant according to the election of grace with the οἱ λοιποί, who nationally shall be grafted in again.

which the light of the glorious Gospel shall dispel the darkness of heathenism. There can be nothing inconsistent with His justice, since He has declared He will judge every man according to the light that is revealed to him. No man shall be accountable for what he has not received, but only in respect of what has been committed to him. There is no country or condition of civilisation in which there are no opportunities of improvement, and in which human character cannot expand though necessarily with various degrees of vigour and force. The final destiny of every man cannot be said to rest upon any national decree of predestination, any more than on individual absolute decrees, for if individuals were thus judged it would be in direct opposition to our Lord's declaration, as much would be required from him to whom little had been committed.

There is another aspect in which we may regard the election of Jacob and the rejection of Esau. In the passage from which St. Paul quotes, the prophecy is, "Two nations are in thy womb, and *two manner of people* shall be separated from thy bowels, and the elder shall serve the younger."[1] The election by God of the younger son before the elder prefigured the perfect salvation of the younger brother—the second or spiritual Adam upon the rejection of the elder—the first or carnal Adam.

The first Adam was created for glory and honour—he was made a *vessel for honour*, but following his own will rather than the will of his Creator, he was rejected and thus became a vessel unto dishonour. On the one hand, the second Adam, the Lord from heaven, the quickening Spirit, following not His own will, but ever submitting to the will of His Father, even unto death by accepting the righteous judgment of God on the flesh, became a vessel unto honour. Under these two heads, the two Adams, we see the two vessels, the vessel unto honour and the vessel unto dishonour, the former the elect vessel, the latter the reprobate. Those who follow the flesh partake of its reprobation, and those who follow the Spirit partake of its election. The sentence of death and dishonour passed on the first Adam is the sentence of reprobation, by which flesh is for ever excluded from the kingdom of God, as it is written, "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, neither doth corruption inherit incorruption."[2] God has passed by the first vessel and chosen the second, and this is His election, not that He has appointed one man to be holy and another to be unholy, one to be saved and another to be lost, but that if any man will die with Christ who nailed the natural for us to the cross, he shall live with Him; if any man will walk after the Spirit and crucify the body of the flesh, he shall be a vessel unto honour, chosen in Christ.

The figure of the potter may well be construed as illustrating

[1] Gen. xxv. 23. [2] 1 Cor. xv. 50.

not so much the right of the potter to make a vessel good or bad according to his own pleasure as of his right, if the vessel turn out ill in his hands, to reject the vessel. And it is important to bear this in remembrance, for it is one of the strong points of the Calvinists that St. Paul is vindicating the right of the Almighty Potter to make one vessel to honour and another to dishonour. "Hath not the potter power over the clay of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour and another unto dishonour," are very strong words, and should be considered in connection with the 18th chapter of the prophet Jeremiah, to which allusion is made. There it is written, "The word came to Jeremiah from the Lord saying, Arise and go down to the potter's house, and there I will cause thee to hear my words. Then I went down to the potter's house, and behold he wrought a work on the wheels, and the vessel that he made of clay was marred in the hands of the potter; so he made it another vessel, as seemed good to the potter to make it. Then the word of the Lord came unto me saying, O house of Israel, cannot I do with you as this potter? saith the Lord. Behold as the clay is in the potter's hand, so are ye in My hand, O house of Israel."[1]

The prophet thus goes on, "At what instance I shall speak concerning a nation and concerning a people, to pluck up and to pull down and to destroy it, *if that nation* against whom I have pronounced, *turn from their evil*, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them. And at what instant I shall speak concerning a nation and concerning a kingdom to build and to plant it; if it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then I will repent of the good wherewith I said I would benefit them. Now *therèfore* go to, speak to the men of Judah and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, saying, Thus saith the Lord, *Behold I frame evil against you*, and devise a device against you, *return ye now every one* from his evil ways, and make his ways and his doings good."[2] This shows that the future prospects of men are placed by God—so to speak—in their own hands, at least to this extent, that the change of their conduct will bring about change in regard to the mode in which God will deal with them, a position totally opposed to Calvinism. In the parable the Jews were warned that God was not bound to them merely because they were His chosen people, but that He was at liberty to reject them if they walked not in His counsel. It was spoken to dissuade them from the idea of unconditional election and to show them their great danger. They were shown that though they had been made as a nation "a vessel unto honour," yet by their abuse of their privileges and hardness of heart they might constrain Him to cast them off for a time, and to make them into "vessels unto dishonour." When St. Paul cites the parable, he does it in the

[1] Jer. xviii. 1-6. [2] Jer. xviii. 9-11.

form of a question, and clearly aims rather at silencing the objector by instancing God's undoubted right to act as the Potter, and to make a vessel as He thinks fit, rather than as placing before us the real state of the case.[1]

It is worthy of note that it is not said that the potter made *another vessel*, but that he made *it*—that is the clay of the first marred vessel—into another vessel. This shows that the purpose of God was to be fulfilled not by making an entirely new vessel, but in making up the clay of the original marred vessel into another vessel. It reveals God's mode of acting, that when the first vessel representing the fallen state of man in the first Adam was marred in the hands of the Potter, the second vessel standing in the second Adam was raised out of the ruins of the fall. What was sown in corruption is raised in incorruption, what was sown in dishonour is raised in glory; what was sown in weakness is raised in power.[2]

One portion of Holy Scripture often throws light on another portion, and this is especially the case where one passage has a direct reference to another, as the passage under consideration in the Epistle to the Romans has to the parable of the prophet Jeremiah. We see that St. Paul is but asserting the right of the Almighty to reject and cast off the Jews. That this is the correct interpretation is confirmed by the consideration of the preceding verses. Take for instance verses 7 and 8, "Neither because they are the seed of Abraham are they all children, but in Isaac shall thy seed be called; that is, they which are the children of the flesh, they are not children of God, but the children of the promise are counted for a seed." Reading this passage in connection with the passage in the 4th chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians, v. 22-24, where we find these things are an allegory, we see that the history of Ishmael and Israel was intended by God to be a type, by which He declared that while He was calling the family of Abraham to be His chosen people, His real choice rested not on a natural family, but on a character; that not the flesh, but the spirit should inherit the blessing; that He would reject the carnal mind and choose the spiritual. This interpretation opens up the meaning of the whole chapter. Thus when it is said, "the elder shall serve the younger," that is, the flesh which is the first Adam shall be subjected to the quickening Spirit who is the second Adam. "Jacob I loved, but Esau I hated," that is, the spiritual mind I loved, but the natural mind which is enmity to God, I hated. "He hath mercy on whom He will, and whom He will He hardeneth," that is, "He hath mercy on the spirit, and He hardeneth the flesh."

So much for the allegorical interpretation which seems to be

[1] See St. Chrys. Hom. xvi. Alford, Greek Test., vol. 2, p. 411, Ed. 1880.
[2] 1 Cor. xv. 42, 43.

one aspect of the passages under consideration, and to return to the literal.

It should be remembered that the passage "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion," on which so much stress is laid by the supporters of absolute decrees, is quoted from Exodus, and is the assurance which God gives to Moses that He has separated the Hebrew nation as His chosen people from all the people on the earth.[1]

The true meaning of the original seems to be "whenever I have mercy on any it shall be *pure mercy*, no human desert contributing," which, says Dean Alford, agrees better with the next verse than the ordinary rendering which lays the stress on the ὃν ἂν; and is not inconsistent with verse 18, ὃν θέλει, ἐλεεῖ; because if God's mercy be *pure mercy* without any desert on man's part, it necessarily follows that He has mercy on whom He will, His will being the only assignable cause of the selection.

It is to this declaration that the Apostle naturally refers the Jews whom he is particularly addressing as evidence that their election as a nation proceeded from the absolute sovereignty of God, and he argues therefrom that the same supreme will which elected them at one time, might at another time elect another people even to their rejection for a season.

The case of Pharaoh was cited as analogous to their case. He had hardened his heart against God and striven to impede Him in the carrying out of His purpose; so they—the Jews—had rejected their God in the Person of the Messiah, and had endeavoured to stay the unfolding and further revelation of the mercy and goodness of the Lord in the creatures' redemption. They were warned by the example of Pharaoh and his destruction.

Now the case of Pharaoh which the Apostle cites has been the cause of much discussion, and in the hands of Calvinists is a favourite instance of reprobation.

There are passages in Scripture which show us that Pharaoh hardened his own heart, as is expressly stated in the 9th chapter of Exodus. And even in the cases where it is stated in our version that God hardened Pharaoh's heart it is contended by some that the better rendering would be that God *suffered* the heart of Pharaoh to be hardened.[2] "Those places of Scripture," says Dr. Jortin,[3] "are easily reconciled, in which the wicked are represented

[1] Exod. xxxiii. 19.

[2] Exod. viii. 15; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 13; Prov. xxviii. 14; Heb. iii. 13.

[3] Diss. 1st. Origen makes out the hardening of Pharaoh's heart to be an accidental effect of God's kindness and mercy towards him, in removing that sharp and uneasy though salutary discipline, which being carefully and rightly made use of became an occasion of a greater hardness and obduracy; as when a master forbears to punish a wicked servant, and says, "I have spoiled you, and I have made you wicked." In like manner those things which proceed from God's benignity and goodness, as if they had been the cause of Pharaoh's obduracy, are said to harden his heart. See Orig. Philocal. cap. 27.

usually as hardening themselves, and sometimes as being hardened of God. They harden themselves, because it is by their own choice, by their own obstinacy and perverseness that they become obdurate; and they are hardened of God, not by any proper and immediate act of God, depriving them of reason and of liberty or compelling them to do evil; but quite on the contrary, by His continuing to give them both motives and opportunities to do well; which gifts being rejected and abused are the innocent cause, or the occasion of their greater wickedness, and in this sense they are hardened by the very goodness of God. Besides, in the style of Scripture, God is often said to do what He only permits to be done; and in all other languages also, the occasion is put for the cause, both as to persons and as to things. 'I came not to send peace upon earth, but a sword,'[1] says our Lord; that is, My Gospel, though it ought to produce peace and love, will prove the occasion of strife and enmity."

But even allowing that God did literally harden Pharaoh's heart, it cannot be admitted that his final obduracy was the result of God's absolute decree; his own previous obstinacy drew down upon him the just judgment. The hardening of Pharaoh's heart was a strictly judicial act, and it is remarkable how it was measured out to him as he had meted out to others. Ten times it is recorded that Pharaoh hardened his heart (or his heart "remained hard") against God,[2] and ten times that the Lord hardened Pharaoh's heart.[3] But Pharaoh had previously hardened or kept hard his heart *seven* times before the Lord for the first time is said judicially to have hardened his heart. The hardening therefore of the heart of Pharaoh was no arbitrary proceeding arising from some decree to this effect, but was a judicial act induced by the perverseness of the man. That Pharaoh hardened his own heart was his sin; that the Lord hardened it was his punishment. The last was an act of righteous retributive justice upon an obstinate sinner, who in the wickedness of his heart challenged the wrath of God.

It is a common delusion that Pharaoh was an untried man, but the Scriptures abundantly show that he had for years before the deliverance of Israel from the bondage of Egypt, exercised the most unrelenting tyranny over the Israelites, so that they "sighed by reason of the bondage and they cried, and their cry came up unto God by reason of their bondage." . . . . And God said unto Moses, "I have surely seen *the affliction* of my people which are in Egypt and have heard their cry by reason of their task-masters; for I know their sorrows. Now, therefore, behold the cry of the

[1] Matt. x. 34.

[2] Exod. vii. 13. The authorised version is in error here, the expression is exactly the same as in v. 22, and viii. 19, 14, 22; viii. 15, 19, 32; ix. 7, 34, 35; xiii. 15.

[3] Exod. iv. 21; vii. 3; ix. 12; x. 20, 27; xi. 10; xiv. 4, 8, 7.

children of Israel is come unto Me: and I have also seen the oppression wherewith the Egyptians oppress them."[1]

Pharaoh therefore had for a long time oppressed and tyrannised over the chosen people, and if God had cut him off suddenly without further warning, he would have been justly punished. But instead of doing so God gave him space to repent by placing him in new circumstances and sending him a direct messenger to warn him of his danger. The wonders which were wrought to convince the mind of Pharaoh that he was opposing his will to the will of God, instead of softening his heart hardened it.

It is urged, however, that the 17th verse of the 9th chapter of the Romans states that for this purpose, that is for the purpose of God showing His power in him, he was *raised up*. "Even for this same purpose I raised thee up, that I might show my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth." Now this does not mean, as some Calvinists contend, that Pharaoh was so raised from the birth—created with the very object of destruction, but raised up from the plagues which would have cut him off, and preserved from his already merited destruction to be a more striking example to others.[2]

The word translated *raised thee up*, ἐξήγειρα, signifies the raising out of some low condition—from disease, or danger, or poverty. The word used here by St. Paul is found in one other place only in the New Testament (1 Cor. vi. 14) where it refers to resurrection. The Hebrew words in Exod ix. 16, translated "I have made thee stand," which the Chaldee renders "raised thee" (from the danger before spoken of—the pestilential disease or murrain that had lately been upon the land) in the Septuagint is expressed by διετηρήθης, 'thou wert kept, guarded, not suffered to fall into it, preserved and kept alive.'[3]

Whatever construction we may feel inclined to put upon the whole case it certainly cannot be regarded as an authority on which to base such a statement as the following of Calvin:—"Forasmuch as the reprobates do not obey the word of God, we may well charge their disobedience upon the wickedness of their hearts, provided we add at the same time that they were devoted to this wickedness because by the just and unsearchable judgment of God, they were *raised up to illustrate His glory by their damnation.*" "Modo simul adjiciatur, ideo in hanc pravitatem addictos, quia justo, sed inscrutabili Dei judicio suscitati sunt ad gloriam ejus sua damnatione illustrandam."[4]

It is true, as the Apostle says, "He will have mercy on whom

[1] Exod. ii., iii.

[2] It is evident that Pharaoh justly looked upon every plague as a "death." "Entreat the Lord, your God," he says, "that He may take away from me this death only," Exod. x. 17. And if every plague was a death to Pharaoh, so was every removal of a plague a raising him up.

[3] 1 Kings xii. 32; xv. 4; Isai. 6; Esth. iv. 5; Dan. xi. 11.

[4] Inst. lib. iii. c. xxiii. § 7; c. xxiv. § 14.

He will have mercy, and whom He will He hardeneth,"[1] but this does not authorise such a statement as that of the Geneva Reformer above, nor does it imply an arbitrary exercise of God's will in His dealings with mankind generally. Scripture should be compared with Scripture for the explanation of difficult passages, the plainer passages often throwing light on and explaining those more obscure. As Bishop Hall very truly says, "The Holy Ghost ought to be the judge of all controversies; and those passages or texts in the Bible which seem to mention things obscurely or else transiently, should be tried by those others that speak out more plainly and clearly, and treat of the matters with design." Following this excellent advice, what do we find? Our Saviour Himself says, "Blessed are the merciful for they shall obtain mercy."[2] Other Scriptures are—"God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace to the humble."[3] "The mercy of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting upon them that fear Him and remember His commandments to do them."[4] And on the other hand, because "His people would not hearken to His voice and Israel would none of Him, He gave them up unto their own heart's lust, and they walked in their own counsel;"[5] and He refused to hear them who "set at nought His counsel, and would none of His reproof; for that they hated knowledge, and did not choose the fear of the Lord."[6]

It is most clear from revelation that God favours those who yield to His influence, who resist not His Holy Spirit, but rejects and abandons, or drives headlong to their ruin men who resist His will. That the latter was the unhappy case of Pharaoh there can be little doubt. He was a type of that class of wicked and rebellious men, who, despising the chastening of the Lord, are bent on pursuing their own schemes, find to their destruction that they are themselves made subservient to those very purposes which they endeavour to defeat. They are sustained aloft for a time—seemingly prosperous in iniquity—but it is merely that their fall may be the more exemplary. They flatter themselves for a time, with the apparent success of their wickedness and finally awake to the fact that their punishment is the more instructive. Such cases are by no means rare: and it is only when the consideration of the circumstances of such cases involve men in metaphysical perplexities that they assert that they are incompatible with the acknowledged attributes of God, or with the free agency of man.

[1] The attempt made by some to evade the force of the passage by rendering σκληρύνω "treating hardly," is hardly worth noticing. On it Dean Alford observes, "The frequent recurrence of the expression σκληρύνειν τὴν καρδίαν in the history of Pharaoh should have kept commentators from attempting to give to σκληρύνω the sense of *treating hardly*, against which the next verse would be decisive if there were no other reason for rejecting it."

[2] Matt. v. 7.
[3] Jam. iv. 6.
[4] Psl. ciii. 17, 18.
[5] Psl. ~~xxxi~~. 11, 12.
[6] Prov. i. 25, 29.

81

"Whatever difficulty there lies in this assertion," says Dean Alford,[1] "that God *hardeneth* whom He will, lies also in the daily course of His providence, in which we see this hardening process going on in the case of the prosperous ungodly man. The fact is patent, whether declared by revelation or read in history; but to the solution of it and its reconciliation with the equally certain fact of human responsibility, we shall never attain in this imperfect state, however we may strive to do so, by subtle refinements and distinctions. The following is the admirable advice of Augustine,[2] from whom in this case it comes with double weight: 'Satis sit interim Christiano ex fide adhuc viventi, et nondum cernenti quod perfectum est, sed ex parte scienti, nosse vel credere quod neminem Deus liberet nisi gratuitâ misericordiâ per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, et neminem damnet nisi æquissimâ veritate per eundem Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum. Cur autem illum potius quam illum liberet aut non liberet, scrutetur qui potest judiciorum ejus tam magnum profundum, verumtamen caveat præcipitium.'"

Eph. i. 3-5.

Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ εὐλογήσας ἡμᾶς ἐν πάσῃ εὐλογίᾳ πνευματικῇ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ, καθὼς ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐτῷ πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ ἐν ἀγάπῃ, προορίσας ἡμᾶς εἰς υἱοθεσίαν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς αὐτόν, κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ.

Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in the heavenly places in Christ; according as He chose us in Him before the foundation of the world, *that we should be holy and without blame before Him in love;* having predestinated us unto adoption as children *by Jesus Christ to Himself,* according to the good pleasure of His will.

The Apostle here treats of the predestination and election of the Gentiles to partake of the blessings of Christianity with the Jews. He gives God thanks for the infinite benefit brought to the Church, including Jew and Gentile, by the revelation of His mystery, and he "makes known" to the Ephesians "the mystery of God's will who purposed in Himself," predestinated, or resolved "before the foundation of the world" "to gather together in one all things in Christ." It is the revelation of the mystical Body of Christ which St. Paul unfolds—in which there is "neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free, but Christ is all and in all."[3]

The whole passage may, at first sight, seem to favour the idea of individuals being predestinated to the certainty of happiness in a future state, but when examined carefully with the context it will be found to refer to the Church *collectively,* or to the individuals

[1] Greek Testmt., Ed. 1880, vol. 2, p. 409.
[2] Aug. ad Sixtum, Ep. cxciv. 6, 23.
[3] Col. iii. 11.

gathered into the Church on earth. The change in the Divine economy by which the Gentiles were called into the Church constituted that eternal purpose of God formed in His good pleasure before the world was; and darkly shadowed forth by the prophets but then made known by the Church; and this was the predestination affecting the Ephesians by which they received the adoption of children.

The Apostle calls them "saints," for he writes to them as in a state of salvation, as those sanctified by the Holy Spirit, and being conformed to the image of Christ, but still he does not represent their salvation as infallibly certain; for he exhorts them to "walk worthy of the vocation wherewith they were called,"[1] which implies that there was a fear of their not doing so; and also to "guard them against those deceits which bring down the wrath of God upon the children of disobedience."[2]

In the sense, therefore, in which St. Paul uses the words it was possible for those who were "saints," "chosen" and "predestinated," to walk unworthy, and consequently to fail of eternal salvation. They were placed in a condition of salvation, in a condition attended with great privileges and advantages, in a position the most favourable for obtaining the glorious reward held out to them. But these privileges and advantages arose not from any merits of their own, but from the *free choice*, the unmerited favour and mercy of God which they gained and appropriated as it were to themselves, not by works, but by faith evidenced by works. These privileges and advantages might be forfeited by deliberate wickedness and sin, and therefore the Apostle warns them to "walk circumspectly, not as fools but as wise, redeeming the time, because the days are evil."[3] He in particular warns them not to grieve the Holy Spirit of God, "whereby they are sealed unto the day of redemption;"[4] and he exhorts them "to do the will of God from the heart, knowing that whatsoever good things any man doeth, the same shall he receive of the Lord, whether he be bond or free."[5] What can be clearer than that the Apostle knew there was a possibility of the Ephesians grieving the Holy Spirit, of their not doing the will of God, and of their finally falling away? Why warn them of a danger which by an irrevocable decree of predestination could never have befallen them?

Eph. i. 11.

Ἐν ᾧ καὶ ἐκληρώθημεν, προορισθέντες κατὰ πρόθεσιν τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐνεργοῦντος κατὰ τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ.

In whom also we were made an heritage, having been predestinated *according to the purpose of Him who worketh all things after the counsel of His will.*

[1] Eph. iv. 1.
[2] Eph. v. 6.
[3] Eph. v. 6, 7, 8, 10, 15, 16.
[4] Eph. iv. 24-30.
[5] Eph. vi. 8.

This is the text upon which the first section of Chapter III. of the Westminster Confession of Faith is mainly founded. It is one of Calvin's strong texts. There is, however, nothing more in it than is expressed in many other parts of Scripture, and certainly nothing on which to found so startling a proposition as the Calvinists base thereon. The "working of all things after the counsel of His will," here spoken of, relates merely to the providential arrangement of God, whereby the Gospel should be declared to the whole body of the Gentiles as well as to the Jews, and that all who would respond to the glad tidings should be placed in a state of salvation; and there is nothing to warrant the assertion that it relates to any unchangeable pre-ordination of God fixing what shall come to pass in respect of each individual, so that all his actions in this world and his future happiness or misery in the next are unchangeably predestinated. The statement is that God works all things after the counsel of His will; and His will, as revealed in Holy Scripture, is that every reasonable creature shall be free to accept or reject His grace, and that as he does the one or the other he is accountable to Him who is "no respecter of persons," and "who rewards every man according to His works."

"It is to be considered," says St. Jerome,[1] referring to the passage under consideration, "that predestination and purpose are here placed together, according to which God worketh all things after the counsel of His own will. Not that all things which are done in the world are done with the will and counsel of God, for then wicked things might be imputed to God; but that all things which He does, He does with counsel and will, because they are full of reason and of the power of Him who acts. We men will to do most things with counsel, but effect by no means follows the will. But no one can resist Him, to prevent His doing whatever He wills. But He wills those things which are full of reason and counsel. 'He wills all men to be saved and to come into the knowledge of the truth.'[2] But because no one is saved without his own will (for we have free will), He wills us to will that which is good, that when we have willed it He Himself also may will to fulfil His own counsel in us."

1 Thess. i. 4.

Εἰδότες, ἀδελφοὶ ἠγαπημένοι ὑπὸ Θεοῦ, τὴν ἐκλογὴν ὑμῶν.

Knowing, brethren beloved of God, your election.

The Apostle knew that the whole of the members of the Church of Thessalonica were elected of God, and he gives this reason, "for our Gospel came not to you in word only, but in power."[3] He could not have known that all the members of that Church were absolutely assured of eternal salvation, besides which he afterwards

[1] Bened. Ed., vol. iv., part I., p. 331.
[2] 1 Tim. ii. 4.
[3] 1 Thess. i. 5.

expresses his fears "lest Satan should have tempted them, and his (the apostle's) labour should have been in vain."[1]

2 Thes. ii. 13.

Ἡμεῖς δὲ ὀφείλομεν εὐχαριστεῖν τῷ Θεῷ πάντοτε περὶ ὑμῶν, ἀδελφοὶ ἠγαπημένοι ὑπὸ Κυρίου, ὅτι εἵλετο ὑμᾶς ὁ Θεὸς ἀπ' ἀρχῆς εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐν ἁγιασμῷ πνεύματος καὶ πίστει ἀληθείας.

But we are bound to give thanks alway to God for you, brethren beloved of the Lord, because God from the beginning chose you to salvation, *through sanctification of the spirit and belief of the truth.*

Here the Apostle distinctly says the election is from the beginning and is to salvation; but this is no absolute election, for he calls upon the very same persons "to depart from every brother who walked disorderly and not according to the traditions he had received,"[2] and not to mix themselves with those who would not obey the words of the Apostle. He shows that the Thessalonians were, through sanctification of the spirit and belief of the truth, chosen to salvation. They were chosen in Christ, chosen to be members of His mystical Body, and were now enabled to obtain eternal salvation; but it was not infallibly certain. St. Paul feared "lest by some means the tempter should have tempted them, and his labour been in vain," and it actually appears that some of them did "walk disorderly."

2 Tim. ii. 10.

Διὰ τοῦτο πάντα ὑπομένω διὰ τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς.

Therefore I endure all things for the elect's sakes.

The Apostle here says he endures all for the elect's sakes, and the expression includes not merely suffering, but readiness and persistence. "I am enduring, ready to bear all things." He submits with readiness to all his sufferings and labour, knowing that thus he promoted the salvation of the elect. He knew that if they were strong he was so, if they were weak he became so. All being members of the same Body, one could not suffer without the others being affected. What he says is perfectly consistent with the scriptural doctrine of Election, but entirely opposed to the Calvinistic doctrine that the elect are persons infallibly destined to salvation.

1 Pet. ii. 7, 8.

Ὑμῖν οὖν ἡ τιμὴ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν· ἀπιστοῦσι δὲ Λίθος ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας, καὶ λίθος προσκόμματος καὶ πέτρα σκανδάλου, οἱ προσκόπτουσι τῷ λόγῳ ἀπειθοῦντες, εἰς ὃ καὶ ἐτέθησαν.

Unto you therefore which believe He is precious; but for them which disbelieve, the stone which the builders disallowed, the same was made the head of the corner, and a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence; for they stumble at the word, being disobedient; whereunto also they were appointed.

[1] 1 Thess. iii. 5.

[2] 2 Thess. iii. 6, 11.

From these words it is argued that some of the Jews, those who believed not in the Messiah, were *appointed* by God to be disobedient and consequently to damnation. But they have no such meaning. The passage might be paraphrased thus: To you that believe, belongs (ἡ τιμὴ) the honour of being built upon that corner stone which the builders rejected, but to them that are disobedient belongs the prophecy concerning those who reject that corner stone. This is clearly the sense of the passage and the prophecy our Lord Himself had explained when He said to the unbelieving Scribes and Pharisees, "Therefore I say unto you, the kingdom of God shall be taken from you and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof, and whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken, but on whomsoever it shall fall it will grind him to powder."[1]

The passage, then, cannot be understood as teaching that men who stumble at the word, do so, because they have been appointed or predestinated from eternity so to stumble and to be thus disobedient, but must be understood as simply a declaration that it was appointed that if men disobeyed the Gospel it would be to them a stone of stumbling and rock of offence. There are many other passages in Scripture enunciating the same truth. "Behold this child is set for the fall and rising again of many in Israel and for a sign which shall be spoken against, that the thoughts (διαλογισμοί, the reasonings of opposite modes in which truth is received) of many hearts may be revealed."[2] "To the one we are a savour from death unto death, and to the other a savour from life unto life."[3] "Behold the goodness and severity of God: on them which fell, severity; but towards thee, God's goodness, if thou continue in His goodness: otherwise thou also shalt be cut off."[4] Upon these passages it has been well said that were these men appointed by God to disobedience, then disobedience would be the compliance with the Divine appointment or will, and the same act would be both obedient and disobedient. And it seems impossible that disobedience, if it takes place in consequence of an absolute decree of God, should be imputed to man as a fault and be made the ground of punishment.

Mr. Fletcher in his "Equal Check to Pharisaism and Antinomianism" renders the original, "whereunto they have even disposed or settled themselves" in place of "they were appointed," and he observes, "To show that St. Peter's words bear the meaning which I fix to them, I need only prove two things: 1. That the original word ἐτέθησαν, which is translated 'appointed' means also 'settled' or 'disposed.' And 2. That a passive word in the Greek tongue frequently bears the meaning of the Hebrew hermaphrodite voice called 'Hithpael,' which signifies a making

[1] Matt. xxi. 43, 44.
[2] Luke ii. 34, 35.
[3] 2 Cor. ii. 16.
[4] Rom. xi. 22.

oneself to do a thing, or a being caused by one's self to do it; a voice this, which in some degree answers to the 'middle voice' of the Greeks, some tenses of which equally bear an active or a passive sense. To prove the first point, I appeal only to two texts where the word *τίθημι* undoubtedly bears the meaning which I contend for: Luke xxi. 14, *Θέσθε*, 'settle it in your hearts;' and Luke ix. 62, *εὔθετος*, 'fit,' or, more literally, 'well-disposed' for the kingdom of God. And to prove my second proposition, I present the critical reader with indubitable instances of it even in our translation. Jude 10, *φθείρονται*, 'they are corrupted' or 'they corrupt themselves.' 2 Cor. xi. 13, *μετασχηματιζόμενοι*, 'being transformed' or 'transforming themselves.' Acts xviii. 6, *αὐτῶν ἀντιτασσομένων*, literally, 'they being opposed,' or as we have it in our bibles, 'when they opposed themselves.' John xx. 14, *ἐστράφη*, 'she,' Mary, 'was turned,' or 'she turned herself.' Matt. xvi. 23, Jesus, *στραφείς*, 'being turned,' or 'turning himself.' Matt. xxvii. 3, Judas, *μεταμεληθείς*, 'having been penitent,' or 'having repented himself,' &c., &c. In such cases as these, the sacred writers use indifferently the active and the passive voice, because man acts, and is acted upon; he is worked upon, and he works. Thus we read, Acts iii. 19, *ἐπιστρέψατε*, 'convert,' namely, yourselves—actively; though our translators render it passively, 'be converted.'"

It may be mentioned that in the Revised Version the passage in question is rendered as follows: 'For you therefore which believe is the preciousness: but for such as disbelieve, the stone which the builders rejected, the same was made the head of the corner, and a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence; for they stumble at the word being disobedient, whereunto also they were appointed."

1 Pet. ii. 9.

Ὑμεῖς δὲ γένος ἐκλεκτόν, βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα, ἔθνος ἅγιον, λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν, ὅπως τὰς ἀρετὰς ἐξαγγείλητε τοῦ ἐκ σκότους ὑμᾶς καλέσαντος εἰς τὸ θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς.

Ye are a chosen (*or* an elect) generation, *a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye may shew forth the excellencies of Him* who called *you out of darkness into His marvellous light.*

It is evident the Apostle here refers to the calling and standing of those who embrace the Gospel and are baptised into Jesus Christ. They are admitted to the marvellous light of the Gospel, while other nations are still wandering in the darkness of this world. Those called thus are spoken of as a "nation," a "peculiar" people.

1 Pet. v. 13.

Ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτή.

The Church that is at Babylon, elected together with you, *saluteth you.*

That all the members of the Church at Babylon were chosen out of the world and elected by the act of God in holy baptism into the Body of Christ, the Apostle could not be ignorant of; but that they were all absolutely elected to, and infallibly sure of, salvation, he certainly could not say.

2 Pet. iii. 9.

Οὐ βραδύνει ὁ Κύριος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, ὥς τινες βραδυτῆτα ἡγοῦνται, ἀλλὰ μακροθυμεῖ εἰς ὑμᾶς μὴ βουλόμενός τινας ἀπολέσθαι, ἀλλὰ πάντας εἰς μετάνοιαν χωρῆσαι.

The Lord is not slack concerning His promise as some men count slackness: but is long-suffering to usward, not willing that any should perish, *but that all should come to repentance.*

2 John 13.

Ἀσπάζεταί σε τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἀδελφῆς σου τῆς ἐκλεκτῆς.

The children of thy elect sister *greet thee.*

These words are variously understood, according as the Κυρία is taken as referring to an individual or a church. The non-mention of the Κυρία herself here seems rather to favour the latter hypothesis, but there has been much division of opinion. The individual hypothesis was held in various forms by Luther, Piscator, Beza, Grotius, Middleton, Benson, Bengel, De Wette, and others. The ecclesiastical hypothesis, on the other hand, has been held by Jerome, Clement of Alexandria, Hammond, Meyer, and many others.

Jude 4.

Παρεισέδυσαν γάρ τινες ἄνθρωποι, οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρῖμα, ἀσεβεῖς, τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν χάριν μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν, καὶ τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀρνούμενοι.

For there are certain men crept in unawares who were of old foretold to this condemnation; ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying our only Master and Lord Jesus Christ.

The words οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρῖμα, mean literally men of old *prophesied* of as to this condemnation, "ungodly men turning the grace of God into lasciviousness and denying our only master and Lord Jesus Christ." These were evidently men of whom it was "of old set forth," or "before written or prophesied," or "who have been of old written down in prophecy," that they should be condemned for their ungodliness, for Enoch "prophesied of these, saying, Behold the Lord cometh with ten thousand of His saints to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds." Their lusts were of old typified by those of Sodom, their apostacy by that of the fallen angels, and their perdition by that of the Israelites who, though the Lord delivered them out of the hands of Pharaoh, yet were afterwards destroyed through unbelief.

(d) Testimony of the Early Church.

In order to discover what the Fathers really held on any specific subject we must approach them with an unbiased mind and gather their doctrine so far as possible from the whole context rather than from isolated sentences. For it must be remembered that doctrines in their writings, especially in those of the earlier Fathers, present themselves in broad indefinite truths. They were, of course, unaware of the difficulties which the course of time laid bare, and of shades of differences in forms of expression, which only the searching thoughts and penetrating intellects of succeeding ages were able to distinguish. Their mode of thought and expression, too, were so different from ours,—we must take this all into consideration in attempting to gather any particular doctrine from their writings. There has been far too little dispassionate investigation of their works, too much searching for confirmation of views already formed, and the selecting of those sentiments which on their face (and sometimes only so apart from their context) seem favourable to such preconceived opinions to the rejection of those expressions which fail to harmonize therewith.

Before the time of Augustine we find but little in the Fathers' respecting the doctrine of election, and this in itself speaks volumes in favour of the view that they held not the doctrine as subsequently expounded by Augustine and Calvin. Had the doctrine of election and reprobation as taught by Calvin been held in the early Church—had it been taught by the Apostles it must have made an indelible impression on the minds of those to whom it was delivered. It must have filled them with awe and wonder, and could hardly fail to have found utterance in no ambiguous terms. Such a doctrine could not be other than a prominent one in any creed. We find it so with the followers of Augustine and Calvin. They regard the doctrine as one to be ever kept before the mind and one on which we should have clear and decided views.

Clement of Rome.

The Church of God which sojourneth at Rome to the Church of God which sojourneth at Corinth, even those that are *elect*, sanctified by the Will of God, through our Lord Jesus Christ; grace and peace be multiplied unto you from Almighty God, through Jesus Christ.[1]

[1] Ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ παροικοῦσα Ῥώμην, τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῇ παροικούσῃ Κόρινθον, κλητοῖς, ἡγιασμένοις ἐν θελήματι Θεοῦ, διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· Χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ παντοκράτορος Θεοῦ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ πληθυνθείη. Ep. ad Cor. I.

Ye contended both day and night for the whole brotherhood that by mercy and a good conscience the *number of His elect* might be saved.[1]

To these men the Apostles who lived according to the rules of a Divine polity, there was gathered together a great multitude of *the Elect*, who on account of zeal, having endured many sufferings and torments became among us a most excellent example.[2]

Let us therefore draw nigh to Him in holiness of mind, lifting up chaste and undefiled hands unto Him, loving our gracious and merciful Father, who made us a *part of His election.* For thus it is written, "When the Most High divided the nations, when He dispersed the sons of Adam. He set the bounds of the nations according to the number of God's angels. His people Jacob became the portion of the Lord, and Israel the lot of His inheritance." And in another place He saith, "Behold the Lord taketh unto Himself a nation from the midst of the nations, as a man taketh the first fruits of His threshing floor.[3]

Let us therefore cleave to the innocent and just; *for they are the elect of God.* . . . Have we not one God and one Christ? Is there not one Spirit of grace that was poured out upon us all? *Have we not one calling in Christ?*[4] In love were *all the elect of God* made perfect.[5]

Blessed is the man to whom the Lord shall not impute sin, neither is there deceit in his mouth. This blessing belongs to those who have been *elected by God through Jesus Christ.*[6]

Now may God, which seeth all things, the Master of spirits and Lord of all flesh, who *elected our Lord Jesus Christ* and us by Him to be a peculiar people, *grant to every soul* that is called after His glorious and holy name faith, fear, peace, patience, long-suffering, temperance, holiness, and sobriety.[7]

[1] Αγῶν ἦν ὑμῖν ἡμέρας τε καὶ νυκτὸς ὑπὲρ πάσης τῆς ἀδελφότητος, εἰς τὸ σώζεσθαι μετ' ἐλέους καὶ συνειδήσεως τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτοῦ. Epist. ad Corinth i. § 2.

[2] Τούτοις τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ὁσίως πολιτευσαμένοις συνηθροίσθη πολὺ πλῆθος ἐκλεκτῶν, οἵτινες πολλὰς αἰκίας καὶ βασάνους διὰ ζῆλον παθόντες, ὑπόδειγμα κάλλιστον ἐγένοντο ἐν ἡμῖν. Ib. i. § 6.

[3] Προσέλθωμεν οὖν αὐτῷ ἐν ὁσιότητι ψυχῆς, ἁγνὰς καὶ ἀμιάντους χεῖρας αἴροντες πρὸς αὐτόν, ἀγαπῶντες τὸν ἐπιεικῆ καὶ εὔσπλαγχνον πατέρα ἡμῶν ὅς ἐκλογῆς μέρος ἐποίησεν ἑαυτῷ. οὕτω γὰρ γέγραπται· Οτε διεμέριζεν ὁ ὕψιστος ἔθνη, ὡς διέσπειρεν υἱοὺς Ἀδὰμ, ἔστησεν ὅρια ἐθνῶν κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων Θεοῦ· ἐγενήθη μερὶς Κυρίου λαὸς αὐτοῦ Ἰακὼβ, σχοίνισμα κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ Ισραήλ. καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ τόπῳ, λέγει· Ἰδοὺ, Κύριος λαμβάνει ἑαυτῷ ἔθνος ἐκ μέσου ἐθνῶν, ὥσπερ λαμβάνει ἄνθρωπος τὴν ἀπαρχὴν αὐτοῦ τῆς ἅλω. Epist. ad Corinth. i. § 29.

[4] Κολληθῶμεν οὖν τοῖς ἀθῴοις καὶ δικαίοις· εἰσὶν δὲ οὗτοι ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ . . . ἢ οὐχὶ ἕνα Θεὸν ἔχομεν, καὶ ἕνα Χριστὸν, καὶ ἓν πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος τὸ ἐκχυθὲν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, καὶ μία κλῆσις ἐν Χριστῷ. Ib. i. § 46.

[5] Ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ ἐτελειώθησαν πάντες οἱ ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Ib. i., § 49.

[6] Μακάριος ἀνὴρ οὗ μὴ λογίσηται Κύριος ἁμαρτίαν· οὐδὲ ἔστιν ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ δόλος. Οὗτος ὁ μακαρισμὸς ἐγένετο ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐκλελεγμένους ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Ib. i. § 50.

[7] Ὁ παντεπόπτης Θεὸς, καὶ δεσπότης τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ Κύριος πάσης σαρκὸς, ὁ ἐκλεξάμενος τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, καὶ ἡμᾶς δι' αὐτοῦ εἰς λαὸν περιούσιον, δῴη πάσῃ ψυχῇ ἐπικεκλημένῃ τὸ μεγαλοπρεπὲς καὶ ἅγιον ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, πίστιν, φόβον, εἰρήνην, ὑπομονὴν, μακροθυμίαν, ἐγκράτειαν, ἁγνείαν καὶ σωφροσύνην. Ib. i. § 58.

Ignatius.

Ignatius, who is also called Theophorus, to the Church which is at Ephesus in Asia, worthy to be deemed happy, having been blessed in the greatness and fulness of God the Father, *predestinated before the world began, that it should be always unto an* enduring and unchangeable glory; being united and *elected* in true suffering according to the will of the Father and Jesus Christ our God, much happiness in Jesus Christ and His undefiled grace.[1]

Ignatius, who is also called Theophorus, to the holy Church which is at Tralles in Asia, beloved by God the Father of Jesus Christ, *elect* and godly, having peace through the flesh and blood and passion of Jesus Christ, our hope in the resurrection unto Him, whom also I salute in the fulness in the apostolic manner, and pray that it all be joy and happiness.[2]

Polycarp.

When he had this done (*i.e.* the executioner had stabbed him with his sword) there came forth an abundance of blood so that it quenched the fire, and the whole multitude marvelled that there was such a difference between the *unbelievers* and the *elect.* Of whom this most admirable martyr is one, having been in our time an apostolic and prophetic teacher and Bishop of the Catholic Church which is in Smyrna.[3]

Hermas.

God, by His powerful might, established *His Holy Church,* which He hath blessed. Behold, He will remove the heavens and the mountains, the hills and the seas: and all things shall be made smooth *for His elect*; that He may fulfil to them the promise which He hath promised with much honour and joy, if so be they shall keep the statutes of God, which they have received in great faith.[4]

Canst thou tell these things to the *Elect of God?*[5]

[1] Ἰγνάτιος, ὁ καὶ Θεοφόρος, τῇ εὐλογημένῃ ἐν μεγέθει Θεοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ πληρώματι, τῇ προωρισμένῃ πρὸ αἰώνων εἶναι διὰ παντὸς εἰς δόξαν παράμονον, ἄτρεπτον, ἡνωμένην καὶ ἐκλελεγμένην ἐν πάθει ἀληθινῷ, ἐν θελήματι τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν, τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῇ ἀξιομακαρίστῳ, τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Εφέσῳ τῆς Ἀσίας, πλεῖστα ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ καὶ ἐν ἀμώμῳ χάριτι χαίρειν.. Ignat. Epist. ad Ephes. § i.

[2] Ἰγνάτιος, ὁ καὶ Θεοφόρος, ἠγαπημένῃ Θεῷ Πατρὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἁγίᾳ, τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Τράλλεσιν τῆς Ἀσίας, ἐκλεκτῇ καὶ ἀξιοθέῳ, εἰρηνευούσῃ ἐν σαρκὶ καὶ αἵματι καὶ τῷ πάθει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τῆς ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν ἐν τῇ εἰς αὐτὸν ἀναστάσει· ἣν καὶ ἀσπάζομαι ἐν τῷ πληρώματι, ἐν ἀποστολικῷ χαρακτῆρι, καὶ εὔχομαι πλεῖστα χαίρειν. Ib. Epist. ad Tral. § 1.

[3] Καὶ, τοῦτο ποιήσαντος, ἐξῆλθε πλῆθος αἵματος, ὥστε κατασβέσαι τὸ πῦρ· καὶ θαυμάσαι πάντα τὸν ὄχλον, εἰ τοσαύτη τις διαφορὰ μεταξὺ τῶν τε ἀπίστων καὶ τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν· ὧν εἷς καὶ οὗτος γέγονεν ὁ θαυμασιώτατος, ἐν τοῖς καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνοις διδάσκαλος ἀποστολικὸς καὶ προφητικὸς, γενόμενος ἐπίσκοπος τῆς ἐν Σμύρνῃ καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας. Epist. Eccles. Smyrn. apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. iv. c. 15.

[4] Deus,—virtute sua potenti condidit sanctam ecclesiam suam, quam benedixit. Ecce, transferet cælos ac montes, colles ac maria: et omnia plana fient electis ejus; ut reddat illis repromissionem quam repromisit, cum multo honore et gaudio, si servaverint legitima Dei, quæ acceperunt in magna fide. Herm. Past. lib. i. vis. 1. § 3.

[5] Potes hæc electis Dei renuntiare? Ib. vis. ii. § 1.

Those squared and white stones, fitting closely to each other, are the apostles and bishops and doctors and deacons who have ministered holily and modestly to the *Elect of God*, both those who have fallen asleep, and those who are still living.[1]

The white part represents the age about to come in which *the Elect of God* shall dwell, *for the pure and immaculate shall be the Elect of God unto eternal life.* Cease not thou therefore to speak these things in the ears of the saints.[2]

Justin, Martyr.

We (*Christians*) are no mere contemptible mob: but God also *elected us*, and manifested Himself to those who enquire not after Him. Through the like calling that He called Abraham, charging him to go out from the land in which he dwelt; through that voice *He called all of us*, and we have now come out from the polity in which we lived, living wickedly according to the common practices of the other inhabitants of the earth.[3]

Inasmuch as God took unto Himself, out of all nations the nation of the Jews, a nation unprofitable, disobedient and faithless, He hath shewn, that *those who are being elected out of every nation* are through Christ obedient to His counsel.[4]

Irenæus.

And again, "God stood in the congregation of the gods, He judges among the gods;" he speaks [here] concerning the Father and the Son, and those who have obtained the adoption. Now these are *the Church.* For *she is the congregation of God, which God—that is the Son—hath Himself through Himself gathered together.* . . . Who then are these gods, to whom He says, I have said: Ye are gods, all sons of the Most High? Those, no doubt, who have obtained the grace of adoption, by which we cry, Abba, Father.[5]

[1] Lapides quidem illi quadrati et albi, convenientes in commissuris suis, ii sunt apostoli et episcopi et doctores et ministri, qui ministraverunt sancte et modestè electis Dei, qui dormierunt, quique adhuc sunt. Ib. vis. iii. § 5.

[2] Alba autem pars superventuri est seculi, in quo habitabunt electi Dei: quoniam immaculati et puri erunt electi Dei in vitam æternam. Tu ergo ne desinas loqui hæc auribus sanctorum. Herm. Past. lib. i. vis. iv. § 3.

[3] Οὐκοῦν οὐκ εὐκαταφρόνητος δῆμος ἐσμὲν·—ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐξελέξατο ὁ Θεὸς, καὶ ἐμφανὴς ἐγενήθη τοῖς μὴ ἐπερωτῶσιν αὐτόν.—Διὰ τῆς ὁμοίας κλήσεως φωνῇ ἐκάλεσεν αὐτὸν (Ἀβραὰμ), εἰπὼν ἐξελθεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἐν ᾗ ὤκει· καὶ ἡμᾶς δὲ ἅπαντας, δι' ἐκείνης τῆς φωνῆς ἐκάλεσε· καὶ ἐξήλθομεν ἤδη ἀπὸ τῆς πολιτείας ἐν ᾗ ἐζῶμεν, κατὰ τὰ κοινὰ τῶν ἄλλων τῆς γῆς οἰκητόρων κακῶς ζῶντες. Just. *Dial. cum Tryph.* Oper. 272.

[4] Ἐκ πάντων δὲ τῶν γενῶν, γένος ἑαυτῷ λαζὼν τὸ ὑμέτερον, γένος ἄχρηστον καὶ ἀπειθὲς καὶ ἄπιστον, δείξας τοὺς ἀπὸ παντὸς γένους αἱρουμένους πεπεῖσθαι αὐτοῦ τῇ βουλῇ διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Ib. 282.

[5] Et iterum, "Deus stetit in synagoga Deorum, in medio autem deos discernit," de Patre et Filio et de his qui adoptionem perceperunt, dicit. Hi autem sunt Ecclesia: hæc enim est synagoga Dei, quam Deus, hoc est, Filius ipse per semetipsum collegit. . . Quorum autem deorum, quibus dicit: Ego dixi; Dii estis, et filii altissimi omnes? Hi, scilicet, qui adoptionis gratiam adepti sunt, per quam clamamus: Abba, Pater. Iren. *adv. hær.* lib. iii. *c.* 6.

Those things too, concerning Isaac, are not devoid of significance. For, in the Epistle to the Romans, the Apostle says: Rebecca also, having conceived by one, even our father Isaac, received an answer from the Word, that the purpose of God, according to election, should remain; not from works, but from Him that calleth, it was said unto her (Rom. ix. 11), Two peoples are in thy womb, and two nations are in thy belly: and one people shall subdue the other people, and the elder shall serve the younger. From which it is manifest that not only the prophecies of the patriarchs, but also the parturition of Rebecca foretold two peoples, one of which should be the elder and the other the younger; the one of which should be in servitude, and the other free, though still of one and the same father. And one and the same God is both our God and their God, who takes cognizance of hidden things; who knows all things before they come to pass; and who therefore says, Jacob I loved but Esau I hated. The younger people received Christ the first-born, when the older people rejected Him, saying: We have no king but Cæsar. Now in Christ, there is universal blessedness, and on this account the latter people tacitly snatched away from the Father the blessings of the former people, as Jacob stole away the blessing of Esau. For this reason his own brother endured the snares and persecutions of his brother, as too the Church endured this same treatment from the Jews. . . . The wages of Jacob were sheep of various kinds, and the wages of Christ *are men collected out of various and different nations into the one company of the faith.*[1]

Wherefore also the Lord God delivered to other husbandmen, rendering fruits in their season, the figurative vineyard, no longer hedged round, but opened out to the whole world, the tower of *election* being everywhere exalted and beautiful. For everywhere *the Church* is illustrious; and everywhere is the wine-press dug round, for *those who receive the spirit are everywhere.* For since the former husbandmen rejected the Son of God, and when they had killed Him, cast Him out of the vineyard, therefore

[1] Et ea autem, quæ circa Isaac, non sine significatione sunt. In ea enim Epistola, quæ est ad Romanos, ait apostolus: *Sed et Rebecca, ex uno concubitu habens Isaac patris nostri, a verbo responsum accepit, ut secundum electionem propositum Dei permaneat: non ex operibus, sed ex vocante, dictum est ei: Duo enim populi in utero tuo, et duæ gentes in ventre tuo: et populus populum superabit, et major serviet minori.* Ex quibus manifestum est non solum prophetationes patriarcharum, sed et partum Rebeccæ prophetiam fuisse duorum populorum, et unum quidem esse majorem, alterum vero minorem, et alterum quidem sub servitio, alterum autem liberum. Unius autem et ejusdem patris, unus et idem Deus noster et illorum: qui est absconsorum cognitor; qui scit omnia, antequam fiant; et propter hoc dicens, Jacob dilexi, Esau autem odio habui. . . . Junior populus eum primogenitum Christum accepit: cum eum repulit populus ætate provectior, dicens, Non habemus regem, nisi Cæsarem. In Christo autem universa benedictio: et propter hoc benedictiones prioris populi a Patre subripuit posterior populus; quemadmodum Jacob abstulit benedictionem hujus Esau. Ob quam causam fratris patiebatur insidias et persecutiones frater suus, sicut et Ecclesia hoc idem a Judæis patiebatur. . . . Variæ oves quæ fiebant hinc Jacob merces: et Christi merces, ex variis et differentibus gentibus, in unam cohortem fidei convenientes fiunt homines. Iren. *adv. hær.* lib. iv. c. 38.

God gave justly rejected them and *to nations, which* were without the vineyard, the fruits of the cultivation.[1]

Clement of Alexandria.

For He is not the Saviour of some and of others not. But in proportion to each man's ability He dispensed His beneficence both to Greeks and Barbarians, even to those of them that were predestinated, and in due time called, the faithful and elect.[2]

I define the *Church* to be not the mere place of assembling, but *the general assembly of the elect.*[3]

We say that there is only one Ancient and Catholic Church which into the unity of one Faith, that is, according to its proper covenants, or rather according to its single covenant evolved in different times, collects together, by the will of the one God through one Lord, *those already ordained, whom God predestinated.*[4]

Tertullian.

What man is there without sin that God should always *elect* him whom he never could refuse? or who likewise without any good work, that God should always refuse him, whom he never could *elect*? Show a man that is always good, and he will not be refused; shew one that is always evil, and he will never be *elected.*[5]

Cyprian.

Which one Church the Holy Ghost, speaking in the person of the Lord, describes in Solomon's Song, when He says: My dove, my undefiled is one, one she is to her mother; *elect* of her who bare her.[6]

If the day opens equally to all, and if the sun shines upon all with like and equal light, how much more does Christ, the true sun and day, give the light of eternal life in His Church, with like equality! Of which equality we see that a symbol was dis-

[1] Quapropter et tradidit eam Dominus Deus, non jam circumvallatam, sed expansam in universum mundum aliis colonis, reddentibus fructus temporibus suis, turre electionis exaltata ubique et speciosa. Ubique enim præclara est Ecclesia; et ubique circumfossum torcular: ubique enim sunt qui suscipiunt spiritum. Quoniam enim Filium Dei reprobaverunt, et ejecerunt eum, cum eum occidissent extra vineam: justè reprobavit eos Deus; et extra vineam existentibus gentibus dedit fructificationem culturæ. Iren. *adv. hær.* lib. iv. c. 70.

[2] Σωτὴρ γὰρ ἐστιν ὅ οὐχὶ τῶν μὲν, τῶν δὲ οὔ, πρὸς δὴ ἔσον ἐπιστηδειότητος ἕκαστος εἰχεν, τὴν ἑαυτοῦ διένειμεν εὐεργεσίαν, Ἕλλησί τε καὶ βαρβάροις, καὶ τοῖς ἐκ τούτων προωρισμένοις μὲν, κατὰ δὲ τὸν οἰκεῖον καιρὸν κεκλημένοις πιστοῖς τε καὶ ἐκλεκτοῖς. Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. vii. c. 2.

[3] Οὐ γὰρ νῦν τὸν τόπον, ἀλλὰ το ἄθροισμα τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν, ἐκκλησίαν καλῶ. Ib. c. 5.

[4] Μόνην εἶναι φαμὲν τὴν ἀρχαίαν καὶ καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν, εἰς ἑνότητα πίστεως μιᾶς τῆς κατὰ τὰς οἰκείας διαθήκας, μᾶλλον δὲ κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην τὴν μίαν διαφόροις τοῖς χρόνοις, ἑνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τῷ βουλήματ, δι' ἑνὸς τοῦ Κυρίου, συνάγουσαν τοὺς ἤδη κατατεταγμένους, οὓς προώρισεν ὁ Θιὸς. Ib. c. 17. See the continuation of this passage under Chapter "Cause of Election," Just. p. 266

[5] Quis hominum sine delicto, ut eum Deus semper eligeret, quem nunquam posset recusare? Vel quis item sine aliquo bono opere, ut eum Deus semper recusaret, quem nunquam posset eligere? Exhibe bonum semper, et non recusabitur: exhibe malum semper, et nunquam eligetur. Tert. *adv. Marc.* lib. ii. cap. 23.

[6] Quam unam Ecclesiam etiam in Cantico canticorum, Spiritus Sanctus ex persona Domini, designat et dicit: Una est columba mea, perfecta mea; una est matri suæ; electa genitrici suæ. Cyprian, *de unit. eccles.*, Opera vol. i. p. 108.

played in the Exodus, when the manna descended from heaven, and by the prefiguration of future things, pointed out the sustenance of heavenly bread, and the food of Christ who was to come. For there, without any discrimination either of sex or of age, a gomar was equally gathered by each person. Whence it appeared that the favour of Christ and the heavenly grace hereafter to follow, are equally divided to all, without any regard to the difference of sex, without any discrimination of age, without any respect of persons, that the gift of spiritual grace is poured upon all the people of God.[1] The same spiritual grace which is received in an equal degree by believers at their baptism, is evidently afterwards either diminished or increased by our own conversation and conduct; as in the Gospel the seed mentioned by our Lord is sown equally, but according to the variety of the soil some is wasted, and some increases to thirtyfold, or sixtyfold, or an hundredfold.[2]

Ambrose.

The Lord Jesus had come to save all sinners; it was right that He should show His will even with respect to the ungodly;[3] and therefore it was right that He should not pass over even him who was to betray Him; that all might perceive that in the choice of His betrayer, He displayed a sign that all were to be saved. Nor was either Adam injured because he received the command, or Judas because he was chosen. For God did not impose upon the former the necessity of transgression, or upon the latter that of betrayal, because both might have abstained from sin, if each had kept that which he had received. In fact, He knew that all the Jews would not believe, and yet He said, I am not come except to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. Therefore there is no fault in Him who commands, but the sin is in him who transgresses. And as far as was in God, He showed to all that He was

[1] It is clear from the context that St. Cyprian is referring to initial grace—the grace that is given to every man in baptism.

[2] Nam si dies omnibus æqualiter nascitur, et si sol super omnes pari et æquali luce diffunditur, quanto magis Christus sol et dies verus in ecclesia sua lumen vitæ æternæ pari æqualitate largitur? Cujus æqualitatis sacramentum videmus in Exodo esse celebratum, cum de cælo manna deflueret et futurorum præfiguratione alimentum panis cælestis et cibum Christi venientis ostenderet. Illic enim sine discrimine vel sexus vel ætatis gomar à singulis æqualiter colligebatur. Unde apparebat Christi indulgentiam et cælestem gratiam postmodum secuturam, æqualiter omnibus dividi sine sexus varietate, sine annorum discrimine, sine acceptione personæ, super omnem Dei populum spiritalis gratiæ munus infundi. Planè eadem gratia spiritalis, quæ æqualiter in baptismo à credentibus sumitur, in conversatione atque actu nostro postmodum vel minuitur vel augetur; ut in Evangelio Dominicum semen æqualiter seminatur, sed pro varietate terræ aliud absumitur, aliud in multiformem copiam vel tricesimi, vel sexagesimi, vel centesimi numeri fructu exuberante cumulatur. Cyprian, Epist. lxix.

[3] God's grace is effectual in all though in different ways. For it is effectual even in those who reject God's gracious purposes in regard to them; for it reproves their sin, it renders them inexcusable. It likewise vindicates God's mercy and manifests His justice. It vindicates His mercy in that He bestows a talent of grace upon all His servants—slothful as well as faithful—which they in the wickedness of their heart and the perversity of their will bury in the ground. It manifests His justice, for by its means He is able to judge them for rejecting His grace and to render to them according to their works.

willing to deliver all. I do not, however, say that He did not know that there would be transgression; indeed, I assert that He did know it.[1]

The Lord knows who are His. *He wishes all to be His, whom He hath formed and created.* O, man, that you would not flee away, and that you would not hide yourself from Christ. He even seeks after those who flee from Him, and does not wish those who hide themselves to perish; but he cries out, 'Adam, where art thou?' that is, O man, where are you? I have placed you in light, you have sought after darkness.[2]

Every soul is called to the grace of Christ, the word of God itself saying, If any one thirst, let him come unto Me and drink; to whom I shall give water, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living waters.[3]

Sarah says mystically, The Lord hath shut me up, that I should not bear; go in therefore unto mine handmaid, and you shall beget a son from her, in order that you may acknowledge that the *Church of God always existed in predestination*, and that the fecundity of faith was prepared whensoever the Lord should command it to break forth; but that by the will of the Lord it was reserved for a certain time.[4]

God says to Moses, 'I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion. So then it is not of him that willeth nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy.'[5] Perhaps you may say, we ought then neither to will nor to run: but God is wont to desert those who are negligent: therefore he does not say this. But let us consider what he does say: Perseverance is not of the man who willeth nor of him who runneth; for it is not in the

[1] Venerat Dominus Jesus omnes salvos facere peccatores, etiam circa impios ostendere suam debuit voluntatem. Et ideo nec proditurum debuit præterire: ut adverterent omnes, quod in electione etiam proditoris sui servandorum omnium insigne prætendit, nec in eo læsus est vel Adam, quia mandatum accepit, vel Judas, quia electus est. Non enim necessitatem Deus vel illi prævaricationis, vel huic proditionis imposuit, quia uterque si quod acceperat, custodisset, a peccato abstinere potuisset. Denique nec Judæos omnes crediturus sciebat, et tamen ait: *Non veni nisi ad oves perditas domus Israel.* Ergo non in mandante culpa est, sed in prævaricante peccatum est. Et quod in Deo fuit, ostendit omnibus quod omnes voluit liberare. Nec tamen dico quia prævaricationem nesciebat futuram, immo quia sciebat adsero. Ambrose, *de Paradiso*, cap. viii. § 39.

[2] Cognoscit enim eos Dominus qui sunt ipsius. Ille omnes suos vult esse, quos condidit et creavit. Utinam, tu homo non fugias, et te ipse à Christo non abscondas. Ille etiam fugientes requirit, et absconditos non vult perire; sed clamat dicens: *Adam, ubi es?* Hoc est, homo, ubi es? Ego te in lumine posui, tu tenebras requisisti. Ambrose, In Psal. xxxix Enarr. § 20.

[3] John viii. 37, 38. Omnis anima vocatur ad gratiam Christi, dicente ipso Dei verbo: *Si quis sitit, veniat ad me, et bibat. Cui ego dedero aquam, flumina de ventre ejus fluent aquæ vivæ.* Ib. Enarr. in Psalm xlv. § 11.

[4] Mysticè ait Sara: Conclusit me Dominus, ut non pariam; intra ergo ad ancillam meam, et filium facies ex illa; quo agnoscas *in prædestinatione fuisse semper Ecclesiam Dei*, et paratam fidei fœcunditatem, quando juberet Dominus prorumpere; sed, voluntate Domini, certo reservatam tempori. Ib. de Abraham patriarch. lib. ii. c. 10, § 74.

[5] Rom. ix. 15, 16.

power of man but of God who pitieth, that you may be able to complete what you have begun.[1]

There are none who are rejected by Christ, but *there are some who are elected by the Lord;* since the Lord has called things which are not as though they are. *And the nations of the Gentiles are elected,* that the perfidy of the Jews might be destroyed.[2]

Jerome.

He will save those who have received salvation, not by the merit of works, but by the love of God. "For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have everlasting life."[3] But if a wise reader should answer in silent thought, why are many not saved, if He Himself saved them, and loved, and spared His own sons, and redeemed them with His own blood, and raised and exalted those whom He took? A clear reason is inferred: they themselves did not believe, and grieved His Holy Spirit. . . . God therefore was willing to save those who wish to be saved, and He invited them to salvation, that this will might have a reward, but they were unwilling to believe.[4]

Because Nebuchadnezzar received a reward of his good work[5] we understand that even the heathen if they should have done anything good, are not passed over in the judgment of God without reward.[6]

The whole of the Epistle to the Romans stands in need of explanation, and it is involved in so great obscurities that to understand it we have need of the Holy Spirit, who dictated these things by the Apostle; but chiefly this passage, in which some, wishing to preserve the justice of God, say that from antecedent causes Jacob was chosen in the womb of Rebecca and Esau

[1] Moysi dicit Deus: Miserebor cui misertus ero, et misericordiam præstabo, cui misericordiam præstitero. Igitur non est volentis, neque currentis; sed miserantis Dei est. Forte dicas: Ergo non debemus, vel velle, vel currere: atqui negligentes Deus deserere consuevit. Non ergo hoc dicit: sed quid dicat, consideremus. Non volentis, neque currentis hominis perseverantia est; non est enim in hominis potestate sed miserantis Dei est, ut possis complere quæ cœperis. Ambrose. Expos. in Psalm cxviii. Ser. x. § 35.

[2] Non sunt, qui repudiantur a Christo; sunt autem, qui eliguntur a Domino; quoniam Dominus vocavit quæ non sunt, tanquam quæ sunt. Et electæ sunt gentium nationes, ut destrueretur perfidia Judæorum. Ib. Enarr. in Psalm xliii. § 45.

[3] John iii. 16.

[4] Ipse salvabit eos qui receperunt salutem: *non operum merito,* sed charitate Dei. Sic enim dilexit Deus mundum, ut Filium suum unigenitum daret, ut omnis qui credit in eum non pereat, sed habeat vitam æternam. Quòd si prudens lector tacita cogitatione responderit: quare multi non sunt salvati, si ipse salvavit eos, et dilexit, et pepercit filiis suis, et redemit eos sanguine suo; suscepitque et exaltavit assumptos? Infertur causa perspicua. Ipsi autem non crediderunt; et exacerbaverunt Spiritum Sanctum ejus. . . . Voluit itaque Deus salvare cupientes; et provocavit ad salutem, ut voluntas haberet præmium, sed illi credere noluerunt. Hier. Com. lib. xvii. In Isa. Prop. cap. lxiii.

[5] Ezek. xxix.

[6] Ex eo quòd Nabuchodonosor mercedem accepit boni operis, intelligimus etiam. Ethnicos, si quid boni fecerint, non absque mercede Dei judicio præteriri. Ib. Com. lib. ix. In Ezec. Proph. cap. xxix.

rejected;[1] as Jeremiah also and John the Baptist are chosen in the womb,[2] and the Apostle Paul himself is predestinated to the Gospel before he is born. But nothing satisfies us, except what is belonging to the Church, and we are not afraid to speak of publicly in the church . . . . Let us therefore speak as well as we can, and following in the steps of the Apostle's will, let us not depart from his sentiments even a point or the breadth of a finger, as the saying is. He had wept above, and had called upon the Holy Spirit to witness his sorrow and conscience, that his brethren and kinsmen according to the flesh, that is the Israelites, had not received the Son of God: "to whom pertained the adoption and the glory, and the covenants, and the law, and the word of God, and the promises";[3] from whom also Christ Himself was born according to the flesh of the Virgin Mary: and he is so tortured by the constant grief of heart that he wishes himself to be accursed from Christ, that is, to perish alone, lest all the nation of the Israelites should perish. And because he had said this, he immediately foresaw a question which would be brought in opposition. What then do you say? Have all who are of Israel perished? And how have you yourself and the rest of the Apostles and an infinite multitude of Jewish people received Christ, the Son of God? Which he thus solves: In the Holy Scripture Israel is mentioned in a twofold manner and is divided into two sons: into one which is according to the flesh, and into another which is according to the promise and the Spirit. Abraham had two sons, Ishmael and Isaac; Ishmael, who was born according to the flesh, did not receive the inheritance of his father: Isaac, who was born of Sarah, according to the promise, is called the seed of God. For it is written, "In Isaac shall thy seed be called";[4] that is, they who are sons of the flesh, are not the sons of God; but those who are the sons of promise, they are reckoned in the seed. And we prove that this happened not only in Ishmael and Isaac, but also in the two sons of Rebecca, Esau and Jacob, one of whom was rejected and the other chosen. And he says all this that he may show that the people of the Jews were rejected in the two elder brothers, Ishmael and Esau; but that in the two younger, that is Isaac and Jacob, the Gentiles were chosen, or those of the Jews who were about to believe in Christ.[5]

[1] Gen. xxv.
[2] Jer. i. Luke i.
[3] Rom. ix. 4.
[4] Ib. 7.
[5] Omnis quidem ad Romanos Epistola interpretatione indiget: et tantis obscuritatibus involuta est ut ad intelligendam eam, Spiritus Sancti indigeamus auxilio; qui per Apostolum hæc ipsa dictavit: sed præcipuè locus hic, in quo quidam volentes Dei servare justitiam, ex præcedentibus causis dicunt, electum in utero Rebeccæ Jacob, et abjectum Esau, sicut et Jeremias, et Baptista Johannes eliguntur in utero; et ipse Apostolus Paulus prædestinatur in Evangelium antequam nascatur. Nobis autem nihil placet, nisi quod Ecclesiasticum est, et publicè in Ecclesia dicere non timemus. . . . Dicamus igitur, ut possumus, et apostolicæ voluntatis sequentes vestigia, ne punctum quidem (ut dicitur) atque unguem transversum, ab illius sententiis recedamus. Fleverat supra et dolori suo et conscientiæ testem invocaverat Spiritum Sanctum, quòd fratres

The sacred history relates that as a type of the Synagogue and the Church most elders were reprobated by the Lord and the youngest were elected. Thus Cain the elder is rejected while Abel the younger is chosen; thus Ishmael, the son of Abraham, is an alien from his father, while Isaac, the younger, receives the inheritance. Of the sons of Isaac, likewise, Esau, the elder, is a hunter and wanders in the forests, while Jacob, the younger, dwells simply at home. Hence it is written in Malachi, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated. And truly, according to the Apostle, while yet in their mother's womb they had done neither good nor evil, nor had they either merit or offence, so that the one *should be elected* and the other *rejected*, except as we have said in a type of the Synagogue and the Church, the elder is cast aside, and the younger taken.[1]

AUGUSTINE.

But He foreknew what their bad will would do; He foreknew it indeed and because His prescience is infallible, the bad will is not on that account His, but theirs. Why then did He create them whom He knew would be such? Because as He foresaw what evil they would do, so also He foresaw what good He would Himself produce out of their bad actions. For He so formed them that He left them the means of doing something by which, whatever they should choose, even blameably, they would find Him working laudably concerning them. For they have the bad will from themselves, but from Him both a good nature and a just punishment.[2]

sui et cognati secundùm carnem, id est, Israelite, Dei Filium non recepissent: quorum fuit adoptio, et gloria, et testamentum, et legislatio et cultura et promissio: ex quibus etiam ipse Christus secundùm carnem de Maria generatus est Virgine: et tam continuo cordis dolore torquetur; ut ipse optet anathema esse à Christo, id est, solus perire, ne omne Israeliticum genus pereat. Et quia hoc dixerat, statim venientem è regione prævidit quæstionem. Quid ergo dicis? Omnes, qui ex Israel sunt, pericrunt? Et quomodo tu ipse, et cæteri Apostoli, et infinita Judaici populi multitudo, Christum Dei Filium recepistis? Quam ita solvit: Israel in Scripturis sanctis dupliciter appellatur, et in duos dividitur filios: In unum qui juxta carnem est; et in alterum qui juxta repromissionem et spiritum. Abraham duos habuit filios, Ishmael et Isaac, Ishmael, qui secundùm carnem natus est, hæreditatem patris non accepit; Isaac, qui de repromissione generatus ex Sara est, semen Dei appellatur. Scriptum est enim: *In Isaac* vocabitur tibi semen, id est, non qui filii carnis, hi filii Dei; sed qui sunt filii repromissionis, isti existimantur in semine. Et hoc non solum in Ishmael et Isaac accidisse convincimus; sed etiam in duobus Rebeccæ filiis, Esau et Jacob, quorum alter abjectus, alter electus est. Et hoc totum dicit, ut in duobus prioribus fratribus, Ishmael et Esau, populum Judæorum abjectum esse significet: In posterioribus autem, hoc est, in Isaac et Jacob, electum populum Gentium; vel eos qui ex Judæis in Christum crediturí erant. Hier. Hedib. Quæst. x.

[1] Sacra narrat historia, seniores plurimos fuisse à Domino reprobatos, et juniores electos, in typum Synagogæ et Ecclesiæ. Senior Cain abjicitur; et Abel junior eligitur: Ishmael, filius Abraham, alienus à patre est; et Isaac junior hæreditatem accepit. Filiorum quoque Isaac, senior Esau venator est, et vagatur in saltibus: junior Jacob simpliciter habitat domi. Unde scriptum est et in Malachia: Jacob dilexi; Esau autem odio habui. Et rectè, juxta apostolum, nihil, in matris utero constituti, boni vel mali fecerant; nec habebant meritum aut offensam, ut alter eligeretur, et alter abjiceretur: nisi in typo, ut diximus, Synagogæ et Ecclesiæ, senior repellitur, et assumitur junior. Hieron. Com. in Ezech. lib. viii., xxvii.

[2] Sed præsciebat quid eorum factura esset voluntas mala. Præsciebat sanè, et quia falli non potest ejus præscientia, ideo non ipsius, sed eorum est voluntas mala. Cur

Nothing happens in this world by chance. This being established, it seems to follow, that whatever takes place in the world takes place partly from the appointment of God, partly from our own will. For God is by far and incomparably better and more just than the best and most just man. But a just Being ruling and governing the universe, suffers no punishment to be inflicted undeservedly upon any person, and no reward to be given undeservedly.[1]

CHRYSOSTOM.

But as many of a dull mind and perception say things of this kind, that because He has chosen some and loved some and hated others, therefore some are wicked and others good, He persuades by facts correcting the opinion of each of these and producing a proof from works; and He declares even before the thing takes place, that such a man will be virtuous that they may understand His attribute of prescience, and He brings the proof by facts lest any absurd person should say that a man became such as he was through the prediction. Observe how Paul shows this, 'For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil that the purpose of God according to election might stand not of works but of Him that calleth, it was said unto her, the elder shall serve the younger.'[2] For it was not necessary to wait for the event of things, but beforehand He knew who would be wicked and who would not be such.[3]

ergo eos creavit, quos tales futuros esse præsciebat? Quia sicut prævidit quid mali essent facturi, sic etiam prævidit de malis factis eorum quid boni esset ipse facturus. Sic enim eos fecit, ut eis relinqueret unde et ipsi aliquid facerent, quo quicquid etiam culpabiliter eligerent, illum de se laudabiliter operantem invenirent. A se quippe habent voluntatem malam, ab illo autem et naturam bonam et justam pœnam. Aug., *de Genesi ad. lit.* lib. xi. cap. 9.

[1] Nihil igitur casu est in mundo. Hoc constituto, consequens videtur, ut quidquid in mundo geritur, partim divinitus geratur partim nostra voluntate. Deus enim quovis homine optimo et justissimo longe atque incomparabiliter melior et justior est. Justus autem regens et gubernans universa nullam pœnam cuiquam sinit immerito infligi, nullum præmium immerito dari. August. lib. *de diversis Quæst. octoginta-tribus Quæst.* xxiv.

[2] Rom. ix. 11, 12.

[3] Επειδὴ γὰρ πολλοὶ παχύτεροι τὴν γνώμην ὄντες, καὶ ἀναίσθητοι, πολλὰ τοιαῦτα φθέγγονται, ὅτι τὸν δεῖνα ἐξελέξατο, καὶ τὸν δεῖνα ἐφίλησε, καὶ τὸν δεῖνα ἐμίσησε διὰ τοῦτο ὁ μὲν πονηρὸς, ὁ δὲ φαῦλος ἐγένετο· ἀπὸ τῶν πραγμάτων πείθει, τὴν ἑκάστου τούτων διορθούμενος γνώμην, καὶ παράγων εἰς μέσον τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων ἀπόδειξιν, καὶ ἀποφαίνεται μὲν, καὶ πρὸ τῶν πραγμάτων, ὅτι ἐνάρετος ὁ δεῖνα, ἵνα μάθωσιν αὐτοῦ τὴν προγνωστικὴν δύναμιν· ἐπάγει δὲ καὶ τὴν διὰ τῶν πραγμάτων πληροφορίαν, ἵνα μή τις τῶν ἀνοήτων εἴπῃ, ὅτι διὰ τὴν πρόῤῥησιν ὁ δεῖνα τοιοῦτος ἦν. Ὅρα γοῦν καὶ ὁ Παῦλος πῶς τοῦτο δηλοῖ, λέγων Μήπω γὰρ γεννηθέντων, μηδὲ πραξάντων τι ἀγαθὸν ἢ κακὸν ἵνα ἡ κατ' ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις τοῦ Θεοῦ μένῃ, οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων, ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦντος ἐῤῥέθη αὐτῇ, ὅτι ὁ μείζων δουλεύσει τῷ ἐλάσσονι. Οὐδὲ γὰρ δεῖται ἀναμεῖναι τῶν ἔργων τὸ τέλος, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸ τούτων οἶδεν αὐτὸς τὸν φαῦλον, καὶ τὸν οὐ τοιοῦτον ἐσόμενον. Chrysostom, Psalm cxxxviii. § 1.

Chapter III.

THE OBJECT OF ELECTION.

(a) *Generally.*

No election of God has been for the exclusive blessing of those elected; it has been invariably for the blessing of others. By reason of the conduct of mankind generally an election has almost become necessary, so to speak, that God's purpose of blessing all might be best carried into effect.

Three great elections are mentioned in Holy Scripture—the election of Seth, the election of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and the election of the Christian Church. All have arisen from the apostacy of the greater numbers, all have been for the ultimate blessing of mankind generally, and to work out the more effectually that marvellous scheme of mercy and Divine grace which is the delight of both the angels above and of God's children below.

In the first election of Seth we see this: When the wickedness of Cain and his descendants was manifest, God chose Seth and his descendants, he being the appointed seed instead of Abel; then it is recorded,[1] when a son was born to Seth, "began men to call upon the name of the Lord." This election was to preserve the knowledge and worship of the true God which Cain and his descendants had perverted. It was not with the idea of excluding from salvation all others who were not of the seed of Seth, but that God's name might be preserved among the nations—that His promise of the true seed, the great Deliverer, should be kept alive in the hearts of His people; in short, that a way of abundant blessing might ever be open to those who would turn from their evil ways, and call upon the name of the Lord.

Though the hand of God was thus stretched out to His people in His mercy, still apostacy increased, and in the days of Noah all save eight persons perished in the watery deluge. Even after the deluge wickedness again increased in the world, and in the time of Abraham had come to a crisis. The nations had "changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man and to four-footed beasts and to creeping things." The blessed message of forgiveness and of promise had been buried out of sight. Then it became apparent that unless some measures were adopted for preserving the name and purpose of God among the nations, they would soon have been utterly lost sight of and

[1] Gen. iv. 26.

ingulfed in the apostacy then threatening to swallow up every truth of God. Diffused and dispersed over the whole earth, the Divine light had been all but quenched in the surrounding darkness. The scattered rays, therefore, were intended to be collected and concentrated into one focus. The truth, which had become intermingled with vain imaginations, and been corrupted to serve the purposes of a vitiated course of life, must be gathered up and placed under some guardianship. It must be appropriated, so to speak, to some people who must regard it as their peculiar treasure —as their precious trust. God accordingly chose a people singularly adapted to His gracious purpose. He selected a people to guard the common truth—the world's truth, conferring upon them for the rest of the world peculiar honours and peculiar advantages. We read the Lord said unto Abraham, "Get thee out of thy country and from thy kindred and from thy father's house, into a land that I will shew thee. And I will make of thee a great nation and I will bless thee and make thy name great; and *thou shalt be a blessing*; and I will bless them that bless thee and curse him that curseth thee; and *in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed.*"[1] What could more plainly express God's intention of blessing others in the election of Abraham? "Thou shalt be a blessing," and "in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed." When there was a fear that all true knowledge both of God and of a promised Saviour would be lost in the wild superstition which had taken hold of the nations of the earth—when the apostacy had so acquired the upper hand that there seemed a possibility of the very name of God being blotted out from their remembrance, the Lord in His mercy chose out Abraham and his family, that in his seed all the nations of the earth might be blessed.[2]

So the words of the Lord to Isaac when he was chosen out of the family of Abraham were that "in his seed should all the nations of the earth be blessed."[3] It was the same also with Jacob when he was chosen out of the family of Isaac; the Lord's words were that in him and his seed all the families of the earth should be blessed.[4]

However backsliding and perverse the chosen people were through successive ages, they kept alive in the midst of the nations the knowledge of the true God, and shed a light, however dim, on the heathenish darkness with which they were surrounded; and God's purpose was accomplished by a faithful remnant. "For they were not all Israel who were of Israel."[5] Those were the true Israelites who held fast the promise and continued steadfast in the covenant. These were the type of the

[1] Gen. xii. 3; xviii. 18.
[2] Gen. xxii. 18.
[3] Gen. xxvi. 4.
[4] Gen. xxviii. 14.
[5] Rom. ix. 6.

true election afterwards to be revealed in Christ. This the Apostle explains in the Epistle to the Romans where he says, "They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God, but the children of the promise are accounted for the seed, for this is the word of promise. . . . At this time will I come, and Sarah shall have a son."[1] Ishmael and his seed were not the election. The Jews who rejected the Messiah were Abraham's seed truly, as they boast to this day, but only as Ishmael was Abraham's son; that is, after the flesh and not after the spirit. The Apostle likens the Jewish faith which holds to the servitude of the Law of Mount Sinai to Hagar, while the Church of Christ, which yet appears to be unfruitful, but upon which rest the promises and hopes of the kingdom, is likened to Sarah, the princess by whom the blessing is to come to all nations. Hagar represents the earthly Jerusalem, to which the heart of the Jew still clings with affection and desire; Sarah the heavenly, the Jerusalem from above, to which the true election and children of God look for a home. The true children of Abraham are the faithful believers born after the Spirit, their life is heavenly, their hopes are heavenly, and on the heavenly prize their hearts are fixed.

St. Paul clearly shows this in the fourth chapter of his epistle to the Galatians, saying, "Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise. But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the spirit, even so it is now. Nevertheless, what saith the Scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son; for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman. So then, brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free."[2]

The whole Jewish economy was not for the exclusive advantage of the Jews themselves, but for the blessing of all mankind.[3] They were a standing monument of God's providential government to the surrounding nations; and by preserving the principles of the moral law, and the great truths of religion, they were instruments in the hands of God for preparing the way for the coming of that Messiah in whom all the nations of the earth were to be blessed.

In the good providence of God, this time at length arrived—

[1] Rom. ix. 9. [2] Gal. iv. 28-31.

[3] Even in the election of the Jews the Gentiles were not excluded from a present blessing, or the then present means of enjoying all the covenant blessings, for proselytes might be admitted into the congregation of Israel, and thus partake of all the advantages which appertained to the children of Israel. They became a portion of the Elect (see Deut. xxiii. 3-8). "When a stranger will sojourn with thee, and will keep the passover to the Lord, let all his males be circumcised, and then let him come near and keep it: and he shall be as one that is born in the land." (Exod. xii. 48.) From this it appears that when a man became a proselyte all his males were to be circumcised as well as himself, and therefore his children were admitted into all the covenant blessings, they became entitled to all the privileges and immunities of the Jewish nation as well as subject to the whole law, became, in fact, as those "born in the land."

the time when the promised seed of the woman should come forth to bruise the serpent's head, and when the true election should be gathered in the Elect One of God, when the antitype of all the other elections should be revealed.

This was the calling forth, out of all nations, a people redeemed from all iniquity whom He might purify as a peculiar people "zealous of good works." [1]

The object was the reverse of exclusion, it being that all might come to a knowledge of the truth.

No doubt there were high and mighty privileges to which the elect ones in all ages were introduced, and which were, so to speak, brought home to them in the act of blessing, but their election was not primarily for the good of the individuals chosen, and certainly was not made on account of any particular merit or goodness on the part of those elected, but rather that all might be blessed through them. In fact, that they, the elected ones, might be a medium of blessing, and that all who would accept of the proffered salvation might come within the covenant blessings.

Election has always involved the idea of activity in the service of God, and desire for the salvation and blessing of others. The operation of grace in the human heart is to draw it forth in love towards God, and to all the creatures of His hand. Every child of God, every one who has received the life of Christ and who permits the Holy Spirit to guide him in the paths of understanding must feel an irresistible impulse to communicate the new life, or to see it communicated to those around. The elect ones are lights in the world. They partake of the "light which has sprung up for the righteous," and this they shed around. They partake also of the gladness which has arisen for the "upright in heart," and this gladness—this joy in the Holy Ghost, they desire to infuse into others. They become centres of life, which impart life; centres of light, dispersing darkness; centres of joy, spreading gladness. The Lord looks for the overflowing of the vessels filled with His grace, the flowing down even to the skirts of the garments of the anointing oil, the flowing forth of the life and power wherewith He has filled the earthen vessels of eternal life.

The earth drinketh in the rain and bringeth forth fruit for the service of man, and so the dew of Hermon, which descendeth on God's people, must bring forth in them fruit which the hand of Jesus may rejoice to gather. No man can live unto himself. Each is filled with the life of Another, even the life of the Man Christ Jesus, the holy ministering One of God; the One Great Minister of the Sanctuary. Each must manifest that life in the blessing and service of others, even their brethren. Thus are they faithful witnesses to the nations of the earth, that they are indeed true children of that Zion where "the Lord hath commanded the

[1] Tit. ii. 14.

blessing, even life for evermore."[1] This is all part of our calling as children of God—evidence of our love to God and love to the brethren, which is the proof that, as the elect, we have passed from death to life![2]

We may not be able to say why this man is elected and that man not, but we may safely conceive that God chooses the most suitable instruments for His Work. His election is for the blessing of all, *ergo* He chooses those most suitable for this purpose.[3] As Dr. Martensen observes, "The eternal pattern according to which this law of election works, is illustrated for us in the Gospel history of the Apostles and first disciples, who were chosen before the mass of the people that had been indistinctly, yet really impressed by Christ's life, in order that by their election good might be done to that multitude. That just *these* individuals and not others were made the instruments of good, arose out of the arrangement of the economy as a whole; or because the hidden threads of nature and of grace were so intertwined at these particular points, that new personalities, new characters, could here be formed, such as could not be formed at any other points in the then present era of the development of the work of creation."[4]

Luther in a sermon upon the conversion of St. Paul says: "Because Paul did the work (the persecution of the Christians) so earnestly our Lord Jesus had him in His thoughts and said thus to Himself, 'This man may become good, for what he does, he does in earnest. This earnestness which he now employs in a bad work, I will sanctify with My Spirit. I will employ him in a good cause, and will set him against the Jews.'" "In the same manner," adds Luther with the want of modesty he too frequently indulged in, "our Lord and God makes use of me at this day against the Pope and his whole party."

St. Paul certainly does not favour the idea that election is wholly irrespective of suitability for the Divine purpose. Speaking of himself he says, "I thank Christ Jesus our Lord who hath enabled me for that He counted me faithful, putting me into the ministry, who was before a blasphemer, and a persecutor and injurious, but I obtained mercy *because I did it ignorantly in unbelief.*"[5] God no doubt chose the Jews of old as His peculiar

[1] Ps. cxxxiii. 3. [2] John v. 24.

[3] Men say, why is *A* elected and *B* pretermitted, why is this individual or this collection of individuals chosen and that not chosen? We only know the fact and not the mystery of God's counsels, which must be inscrutable to us finite beings. But such objectors would have asked a similar question had *B* been elected and *A* pretermitted. We must leave this to an all-wise, all-just God.

[4] Christian Dogmatics, § 221.

[5] St. Paul in another place reminds Timothy that "God had saved them and called them with an holy calling *not according* to their works, but according to His own purpose and grace, which was given them in Christ Jesus before the world began" (2 Tim. i. 9), and in another place he asserts that he was chosen by the pleasure of God, who separated him from his mother's womb, and called him by His grace to reveal His Son and preach Him among the heathen.

people, knowing them to be the most suitable in His hands for effecting His purpose. So he chose Moses, Elijah, Daniel, and John the Baptist, and though these are cases of individuals, and might well be thought to be exceptional cases in which the Lord chose certain persons as the instruments of His designs and ministers of His revelations, yet it is not improbable, nay it is most likely that the choosing of those who shall hereafter have part in the first resurrection, may not be without regard to their suitability in the hands of the Almighty, for carrying out His yet future work of mercy and grace by them to others.

We find then, that the object of election is first for the blessing of others, and secondly for the blessing of the individuals elected, and as an inducement to deny ungodliness and worldly lust and to walk holily and without blame before God in love. The election of the Christian Church will bring blessing and grace to the Jew—the election of the Jew will bring blessing and grace to the whole world. And this will be perfectly manifested, when the tabernacle of God shall be with men, and "He will dwell with them, and they shall be His people and God Himself shall be with them, and be their God,"[1] when the holy city, new Jerusalem, shall come down out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband—when God's ancient people shall be restored to their own land and inherit the promises made to their fathers, and "the nations of them which are saved" shall walk in the light of the heavenly city, "and the kings of the earth" shall "bring their glory and honour into it."[2]

(*b*) *Testimony of the Old Testament.*

In the following passages we shall see that the object of the election of the Jews was that the name and worship of the true God might be preserved, that the elected ones should be a holy and righteous people unto the Lord, and that all the nations of the earth should be blessed by them.

To Abraham.

Gen. xii. 1—3.

The Lord said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, into a (*or* the) *land that I will shew thee; and I will make of thee a great nation,* and I will bless thee and make thy name great, and thou shalt be (*or* be thou) a blessing; *and I will bless them that bless thee, and curse them that curse thee* (*or* and him that curseth thee will I curse), and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed.

[1] Rev. xxi. 3. [2] Rev. xxi. 24.

Gen. xviii. 17, 18.

And the Lord said, shall I hide from Abraham that (thing) which I do, seeing that Abraham shall surely become a great and mighty nation, and all the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him?

Gen. xxii. 15—18.

And the angel of the Lord called unto Abraham out of heaven the second time and said, By myself have I sworn saith the Lord, (for) because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son; that in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of (the) heaven and as the sand which is upon the sea shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies; and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed.

To Isaac.

Gen. xxvi, 4.

I will make thy seed to multiply (*or* I will multiply thy seed) *as the stars of heaven, and will give unto thy seed all these countries* (*or* lands), and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed.

To Jacob.

Gen. xxviii. 14.

And thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth and thou shalt spread abroad to the west and to the east and to the north and to the south, and in thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed.

Generally.

Deut. xxvi. 18, 19.

The Lord hath avouched thee this day to be His peculiar people (*or* a peculiar people *unto* Himself) *as he hath promised thee, and that thou shouldest keep all His commandments. And to make thee high above all nations which He hath made in praise and in name and in honour,* and that thou mayest be an holy people unto the Lord thy God, *as he hath spoken.*

Psl. cv. 42, 43, 45.

He remembered His holy promise (*or* word) *and Abraham His servant. And He brought forth His people with joy* and His chosen *with gladness* (*or* singing) . . . . that they might observe (*or* keep) His statutes and keep (*or* observe) His laws.

Ezek. xx. 5, 7.

Thus said the Lord God: In the day when I chose Israel *and lifted up Mine hand unto the seed of the house of Jacob . . . . Then said I unto them* cast ye away every man the abominations of his eyes, and defile not yourselves with the idols of Egypt.

(c) *Testimony of the New Testament.*

The following passages may be referred to as showing that the object of Election is as we have already stated it.

Mark xiii. 20.

εἰ μὴ Κύριος ἐκολόβωσε τὰς ἡμέρας, οὐκ ἂν ἐσώθη πᾶσα σάρξ· ἀλλὰ διὰ τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς, οὓς ἐξελέξατο, ἐκολόβωσε τὰς ἡμέρας.

Except that the Lord had shortened those days, no flesh would have been saved: but for the elect's sake, whom He chose, *He shortened the days.*

Rom. ix. 23.

ἵνα γνωρίσῃ τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ σκεύη ἐλέους ἃ προητοίμασεν εἰς δόξαν.

That He might make known the riches of His glory on vessels of mercy which He afore prepared unto glory.

Rom. xi. 12.

Εἰ δὲ τὸ παράπτωμα αὐτῶν πλοῦτος κόσμου, καὶ τὸ ἥττημα αὐτῶν πλοῦτος ἐθνῶν, πόσῳ μᾶλλον τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῶν;

Now if the fall of them be the riches of the world, and the diminishing of them the riches of the Gentiles: how much more their fulness?

1 Cor. vi. 20.

Ἠγοράσθητε γὰρ τιμῆς· δοξάσατε δὴ τὸν Θεὸν ἐν τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν.

For ye were bought with a price; therefore glorify God *in your body.*

Eph. i. 3, 4.

Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ εὐλογήσας ἡμᾶς ἐν πάσῃ εὐλογίᾳ πνευματικῇ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ, καθὼς ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐτῷ πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ ἐν ἀγάπῃ.

Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in the heavenly places in Christ; according as He chose us in Him *before the foundation of the world* that we should be holy and without blame *before Him in love.*

It is said on this text that the election referred to must be rather the act of choice on the part of God, than the result of that choice, or the accomplishment of God's purpose in time, for the Ephesians were chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world. But those holding this view do not seem sufficiently to take into consideration that an election of individuals *apart* from Christ is not spoken of, but an election only *in* Christ. The Apostle clearly does not in this passage refer to a personal election, but to the election in Christ of a body—the election of believing Jews and Gentiles into the Church of God. And even Arminius generally concurs in this view as the correct one. The

text shows that the election is not of holy ones, for they are chosen that they may be holy, which would not have been the case had they been holy before. The individuals addressed are said to have been blessed with all spiritual blessings, to have received the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to Himself, to have been accepted in the Beloved, to have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins, to have obtained an inheritance amongst those whom God hath gathered together in one in Christ, both those who are in heaven and who are on earth, to have been chosen in Christ that they should be holy and without blame, and should be to the praise of the Divine glory (Eph. i. 3-14). These are the very blessings, the very privileges which are brought to the elect by virtue of their baptism into Christ and their admission into the Church of God.

Eph. ii. 10.

αὐτοῦ γάρ ἐσμεν ποίημα, κτισθέντες ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς, οἷς προητοίμασεν ὁ Θεὸς ἵνα ἐν αὐτοῖς περιπατήσωμεν.

For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for good works, *which God before prepared that we should walk in them.*

The expression "*created* in Christ Jesus for good works, which God before prepared that we should walk in them" does not mean prepared by a decree of absolute predestination, but that baptised men and women were by faith in Christ *formed* for good works, which in the course of God's providence He marks out, assigns to, or prepares for each. Thus is shown the truth of the maxim "bona opera non præcedunt justificandum, sed sequuntur justificatum." The great Potter creates anew in Christ. He gives the knowledge of His will and the assistance of His Holy Spirit to enable men to work effectually, and prepares even their works. Truly the steps of a good man are ordered by the Lord. Psl.xxxvii. 23.

Eph. v. 26-27.

ἵνα αὐτὴν ἁγιάσῃ καθαρίσας τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος ἐν ῥήματι, ἵνα παραστήσῃ αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ ἔνδοξον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, μὴ ἔχουσαν σπίλον ἢ ῥυτίδα ἤ τι τῶν τοιούτων, ἀλλ' ἵνα ᾖ ἁγία καὶ ἄμωμος.

That He might sanctify it *(His Church), having cleansed it with the washing of water by the word, that He might present the Church to Himself a glorious Church not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing:* but that it should be holy and without blemish.

Col. iii. 12.

Ἐνδύσασθε οὖν, ὡς ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἅγιοι καὶ ἠγαπημένοι, σπλάγχνα οἰκτιρμοῦ, χρηστότητα, ταπεινοφροσύνην, πραότητα, μακροθυμίαν.

Put on, therefore, as the elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of compassion, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, long-suffering.

2 Thess. ii. 13, 14.

Εἵλατο ὑμᾶς ὁ Θεὸς ἀπ' ἀρχῆς εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐν ἁγιασμῷ πνεύματος καὶ πίστει ἀληθείας· εἰς ὃ ἐκάλεσεν ὑμᾶς διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἡμῶν, εἰς περιποίησιν δόξης τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

God from the beginning chose you to salvation in *sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth: whereunto He called you by our Gospel,* to the obtaining of the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Election is here shown to be that the elect may obtain the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ. They are called to share in the glory which He has, see Rom. viii. 17, 29. Dean Alford draws a distinction between the glory which He has, and the glory of which He is the bestower or source.

Tit. ii. 14.

ὃς ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, ἵνα λυτρώσηται ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἀνομίας, καὶ καθαρίσῃ ἑαυτῷ λαὸν περιούσιον, ζηλωτὴν καλῶν ἔργων.

Who gave Himself for us, that He might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto Himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works.

1 Pet. i. 1, 2.

Πέτρος ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς Πόντου, Γαλατίας, Καππαδοκίας, Ἀσίας, καὶ Βιθυνίας, κατὰ πρόγνωσιν Θεοῦ πατρός, ἐν ἁγιασμῷ Πνεύματος, εἰς ὑπακοὴν καὶ ῥαντισμὸν αἵματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ to the elect who are sojourners of the dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, in *sanctification of the Spirit,* unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ.

The authorized translation by removing the word *elect* out of its place and uniting it with the words "according to the foreknowledge of God," has given some ground for the Calvinists' view, but it is quite clear that the Apostle applies the word to the whole body of Christians dispersed throughout the countries enumerated.

There are many who would limit the address to the Jewish Christians resident in the provinces named, and this is the view taken by Eusebius, Epiphanius, Jerome, Theophylact, Erasmus, Calvin, Grotius, Bengel, and others, but there is nothing in the words to warrant this limitation. It has been more than once pointed out that the παρεπιδήμοις is sufficiently explained in the Epistle itself, chap. ii. 11, as used in a spiritual sense, strangers and pilgrims on earth, and that the διασπορᾶς following may designate the ingrafting of Gentile converts with, and their forming part of God's covenant people who already, according to the flesh, were thus dispersed.[1] On the word "foreknowledge" in this verse,

[1] Alford's Greek Test. vol. iv. c. iii. § 3, where the subject is fully discussed.

Dean Alford remarks, "not merely 'prævisio fidei,' as Calovius, but nearly synonymous with βουλή or προορισμός. It may be, and often is this 'prævisio' merely; see the word πρόγνωσις in Suicer, and Origen in Cramer's Catena; but can hardly be this here, where it is made distinctly to be the moving cause of election. See again on verse 20, where the signification 'fore-ordained' is necessary to the context. 'The difference between προγιγνώσκειν and προορίζειν is this, that in the former idea, the fact of knowledge is especially put forward, seeing that all God's decrees rest on the ground of His omniscience' *Huther*. 'Eligendos facit Deus, non invenit,' is an important remark of Augustine."[1]

The election in the verse under consideration is shown to be *in* (not through) sanctification of the spirit *unto obedience* and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ, pointing out the object or result as regards us, the fruit which we are to bring forth, and the state into which we are to be brought, that is obedience, the obedience of faith and the admission to and standing in the covenant sealed with the blood of Christ. The reference is no doubt to Exodus xxiv. 8, where the covenant was inaugurated by sprinkling the blood on the people. But as Dean Alford points out, we need not confine the virtue of the sprinkling to admission into the covenant; for its purifying power, especially as connected with ὑπακοή, is also in the mind of the Apostle. For the death of Christ is not only *as looking back on the past* a propitiation for sin, thereby removing the obstacle which stood in the way of God's gracious purpose towards man, but also *as looking forward to the future* a capacitating of us for the participation in God's salvation, just as Israel, sin having been atoned for by the sacrifice itself, was admitted into the actual state of reconciliation by the sprinkling on them of the sacrificial blood.[2]

1 Pet. v. 10.

Ὁ δὲ Θεὸς πάσης χάριτος, ὁ καλέσας ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον αὐτοῦ δόξαν ἐν Χριστῷ ὀλίγον παθόντας αὐτὸς καταρτίσει, στηρίξει, σθενώσει.

And the God of all grace, who called you unto His eternal glory *in Christ, after that ye have suffered a little while, shall Himself perfect, stablish, strengthen you.*

We are here shown that the call of God is to His eternal glory in Christ Jesus. "The ὀλίγον παθόντας expresses," says Dean Alford, "the *condition* of their calling to glory in Christ, viz., after having suffered for a short time, παθόντας, as in all cases of an aor. part. connected with a future verb, is to be taken in the strictness of its aoristic meaning as a futurus exactus: the παθήματα are over when the δόξα comes in."

[1] Alford, Greek Test. vol. iv. p. 331, Ed. 1880.
[2] Ib. p. 332. Ed. 1880.

(*d*) *Testimony of the Early Church.*

IRENÆUS.

Wherefore also the Lord God delivers to other husbandmen rendering fruits in their season, the figurative vineyard no longer hedged round but opened to the whole world, the tower of *Election* being everywhere exalted and beautiful. For everywhere *the Church* is illustrious, and everywhere is the winepress dug round: because those who receive the Spirit are everywhere. For since the former husbandmen rejected the Son of God, and when they had killed Him cast Him out of the vineyard, therefore God hath justly rejected them, and hath given to *nations which were without the vineyard, the fruits of the cultivation.*[1]

JEROME

As to the testimony of Paul when he says, As He (God) elected us in Himself before the foundation of the world that we might be holy and without blame before Him—we have so interpreted it that we have followed the ecclesiastical sense of the words. . . . . For the Apostle does not say: He elected us before the foundation of the world, *when we were holy and without blame;* but He elected us *in order that we might be holy and unblamable,* that is, that we who before were not holy and without blame might afterwards become so, which can be stated also concerning sinners converted to better things.[2]

AUGUSTINE.

After quoting Eph. i. 3, he adds—Not, then, because we were to be so (holy and unspotted) but that we might be so. Assuredly it is certain—assuredly it is manifest. Certainly we were to be such because He elected us, predestinating us that we might be such by His grace. Therefore He so blessed us with spiritual blessings in heavenly (places) in Christ Jesus, as He elected us in Himself before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and

[1] Quapropter et tradit eam Dominus Deus, non jam circumvallatam, sed expansam in universum mundum aliis colonis reddentibus fructus temporibus suis, turre electionis exaltata ubique et speciosa. Ubique enim præclara est Ecclesia; et ubique circumfossum torcular: ubique enim sunt, qui suscipiunt Spiritum. Quoniam enim Filium Dei reprobaverunt, et ejecerunt eum, cum eum occidissent, extra vineam: justè reprobavit eos Deus; et extra vineam existentibus gentibus dedit fructificationem culturæ. Iren. *adv. hær.* lib. iv. c. 70.

[2] Testimonium Pauli, in quo loquitur; *Sicut elegit nos in ipso ante constitutionem mundi, ut essemus sancti et immaculati coram ipso;* sic interpretati sumus, ut ecclesiasticum sensum secuti simus. . . . . Non enim ait apostolus: Elegit nos ante constitutionem mundi, quum essemus sancti et immaculati; sed Elegit nos, ut essemus sancti et immaculati; hoc est, qui sancti et immaculati ante non fuimus, ut postea essemus; quod et de peccatoribus, ad meliora conversis, dici potest. Hieron. *Apol. adv. Ruffin.* lib. i. c. 6.

The passage in St. Jerome's *Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians*, lib. i. cap. 1 has not been cited in consequence of the doubt entertained as to the genuineness of this Commentary; see Sextus Senensis lib. iv. p. 247; James's *Corruption of Scripture Councils and Fathers*, 1612, p. 34; Perkins's *Problem*, 1609, p. 565.

immaculate in His sight, predestinating us in love to the adoption of sons through Jesus Christ to Himself.[1]

Therefore God elected us in Christ before the foundation of the world, predestinating us to the adoption of sons, not because we were about to be of ourselves holy and immaculate, but He elected and predestinated us that we might be so.[2]

For He hath elected us, not because we believed, but that we may believe, lest we should be said first to have chosen Him, and so His Word be false (which be it far from us to think), "Ye have not elected Me, but I have elected you." Neither are we called because we believed, but that we may believe: and by that calling which is without repentance, it is effected and carried through that we should believe.[3]

CHRYSOSTOM.

For He did not call us to this spiritual and awful participation of mysteries that after our former wickedness we should enter: but that putting off all filthiness we should be clothed in such garments as become those who are called to a royal banquet.[4]

[1] Non ergo quia futuri eramns sed ut essemus. Nempe certum est, nempe manifestum est: ideo quippe tales eramus futuri, quia elegit ipse, prædestinans ut tales per gratiam ejus essemus. Ita ergo nos benedixit benedictione spiritali in cælestibus in Christo Jesu, sicut elegit nos in ipso ante mundi constitutionem, ut essemus sancti et immaculati in conspectu ejus, in caritate prædestinans nos in adoptionem filiorum per Jesum Christum in ipsum. *De Præd. sanct.* cap. xxxvi. [xviii].

[2] Elegit ergo nos Deus in Christo ante mundi constitutionem, prædestinans nos in adoptionem filiorum; non quia per nos sancti et immaculati futuri eramus, sed elegit prædestinavitque ut essemus. *Ib.* cap. xxxvii. [xviii].

[3] Non enim quia credidimus, sed ut credamus elegit nos; ne priores eum elegisse dicamur, falsumque sit, quod absit, *Non vos me elegistis, sed ego vos elegi.* Nec quia credidimus, sed ut credamus vocamur: atque illa vocatione, quæ sine pœnitentia est, id prorsus agitur et peragitur, ut credamus. *Ib.* cap. xxxviii. [xix].

[4] Οὐδὲ γὰρ διὰ τοῦτο ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ τὴν πνευματικὴν ταύτην καὶ φρικτὴν τῶν μυστηρίων ἐκάλεσε κοινωνίαν, ἵνα μετὰ τῆς προτέρας εἰσερχώμεθα κακίας, ἀλλ' ἵνα ἀποδυσάμενοι τὴν αἰσχρότητα, μεταμφιασώμεθα ἃ τοὺς ἐν τοῖς βασιλείοις ἑστιωμένους ἡμφιάσθαι χρή. Chrysost. Hom. St. John, x. 3.

Chapter IV.

THE CAUSE OF ELECTION.

(a) *Generally.*

By the "cause of election" we do not mean the cause of there being an election, for this we have considered as the object, but merely the cause of some rather than others being the subject of it, or the reason why some are elected rather than others. The cause of election has occasioned much controversy amongst theologians and various have been the views taken. That there is a reason why one is elected and another not, whether we can ascertain it or not is undoubted, for it would be most derogatory to the infinitely wise One to suppose that He acted without a reason. It would not be right to assume that no cause for God's election exists simply because no cause is assigned in Holy Scripture, or because we cannot say distinctly what it is. There may well be no reason in the creature, or none which he can discover, for the election of God; and yet there may be very good reasons why the Election should be made. There is and can be no capriciousness with God, there is, at most, but the absence of revelation.

The cause of election must be either in the Divine Being or in the individuals elected. This is obvious. Now if the cause be in God, then to Him is due the glory only. But if the cause of the choice be something in man of which he himself is the author, and by which he has made himself to differ from another, then though God may be the Elector, yet the merit of such a person being chosen rather than another is to be assigned to the individual chosen, for the merit of the election must be due where the cause of the discriminating choice is found.

Three principal views respecting the cause of election have found currency among theologians—1st, The sovereign Will of God; 2nd, Foreseen merit in the elected—that either more positive moral good existed in them than in others—or, as others hold, more negative moral good, that is, less positive moral evil than in others; 3rd, Foreseen faith, that is, that they would embrace the salvation offered by God and revealed in the Gospel, whilst others reject it.

Many writers in modern times have asserted that all the early fathers who lived before Augustine maintained the impelling cause of God's election to be, with the Arminians, His foreknowledge of

the future holiness of certain individuals,[1] that His predestination was according to His prescience, and that because He foreknew what would happen to each, what would be the future will and condition of each, therefore He determined some to be vessels of honour and others to be vessels of dishonour.

But really most of the fathers before Clement of Alexandria assign no distinct cause, as a few extracts from their writings which we propose giving later on, will clearly demonstrate.

Towards the close of the 2nd century Clement of Alexandria for the first time distinctly assigns the cause to be God's foreknowledge of men's future fitness. "There is," he says, "one only ancient and Catholic Church, which, into the unity of one faith, that is according to its proper covenants, or rather, according to its single covenant evolved in different periods, collects together, by the will of one God through one Lord, those already ordained, whom God hath *predestinated as knowing, before the foundation of the world, that they would be just.*"[2]

He is followed by Ambrose and Jerome if we may accept their respective commentaries on the Romans."[3]

The point never appears to have been fully considered till the time of Augustine, when he proclaimed his scheme of election in the contest with the Pelagians and then it was immediately attacked by his contemporaries. The Christians of Marseilles protested against his doctrine and distinctly asserted that the Divine decree of Predestination rested upon God's prevision of man's future character, and not upon God's absolute will and pleasure, and further they asserted that this had ever been the teaching of the Catholic Church.

We are fully aware that these Christians have been invidiously charged with semi-Pelagianism, and it may be well, therefore, first to clear them from this charge, which can be done from the writings of those who disagreed with them, and who therefore would not have failed, could they justly have done so, to class them with the heterodox. Let us take Augustine himself. He

[1] This is stated by Scultetus in his "Marrow of the Fathers," by Vossius in his "History of Pelagianism," and by Peter Du Moulin in his "Novelty of the Papacy," which he wrote against Cardinal Perron, and in which he says, "All the fathers before St. Augustine, and Augustine himself at first, believed that God predestinated men to salvation according to His own prescience, that this and that person would perform good works and exercise faith." So Melancthon says, "Scriptores veteres omnes, præter unum Augustinum, ponunt aliquam causam electionis in nobis esse." In Rom. ix.

[2] Μόνην εἶναι φαμὲν ἀρχαίαν καὶ καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν, εἰς ἑνότητα πίστεως μιᾶς τῆς κατὰ τὰς οἰκείας διαθήκας, μᾶλλον δὲ κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην τὴν μίαν διαφόροις τοῖς χρόνοις, ἑνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τῷ βουλήματι, δι' ἑνὸς τοῦ Κυρίου, συνάγουσαν τοὺς ἤδη κατατεταγμένους, οὓς προώρισεν ὁ Θεὸς, δικαίους ἐσομένους πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου ἐγνωκώς. Strom. lib. vii. Oper. p. 765.

[3] Ambrose, Com. in Epist. Rom. viii. Opera 1846; Hieron. Com. in Rom. viii. 29; Oper. vol. viii. p. 177; ad Hedib. Epist. cl. quæst. 10. Oper. vol. iii. p. 353. In Malac. i. 23. Oper. vol. v. p. 276. The words attributed to St. Ambrose are, "Hi autem secundum propositum vocantur, quos credentes præscivit Deus futuros sibi idoneos; ut antequam crederent, scirentur. *Nam quos præscivit, et prædestinavit.* Istos, quos præscivit futuros sibi devotos, ipsos elegit ad promissa præmia capessenda."

acknowledges them to be doctrinally sound on the precise points which were controverted by Pelagius and his followers, and in consequence of their being thus doctrinally sound, he distinctly declares them to be so far removed from the heretical perverseness of the Pelagians.[1]

In writing to Prosper and Hilary in reply to the protest of the Marseillian Christians, he says, "Those our brethren on whose behalf your pious charity is solicitous, have, with the Church of Christ, attained to the belief, that the human race is born subject to the sin of the first man, and that no one can be delivered from that evil, save by the righteousness of the Second Man. Moreover they have attained to the confession, that the wills of men are prevented by the grace of God, and that no one is of himself sufficient either to begin or to perfect any good work. *By holding therefore these doctrines, they are very widely removed from the error of the Pelagians.* Further, if they walk in such doctrines and beseech Him who giveth understanding, if they differ from us on the point of Predestination, He will also reveal this to them. Meanwhile, let it be our business to bestow upon them both the affection of love and the ministry of the word, as He whom we supplicate doth grant; that in these letters we may say what may be both plain and profitable to them."[2]

The assigning God's foreknowledge of men's future fitness as the cause of election was no doubt a well meant attempt to remove the injurious reflection upon God's justice, to which assigning the cause to be His absolute and inscrutable will and sovereignty is supposed to be open. But to this it is urged that it is not the way St. Paul deals with the objection, for, instead of accounting for election on the ground that God accepts those whom He foreknows will in the future be holy, he rebuts the presumption of the objector and contents himself apparently with resolving the cause of God's act of election into the exercise of His supreme will.[3]

And further it is objected that we are chosen in Christ, not because we are holy, or because we were contemplated as holy, but that we *may become holy*; and that an attempt is made to

[1] A Pelagianorum porro hæretica perversitate tantum isti remoti sunt, propter quos hæc agimus, ut, licet nondum velint fateri Prædestinatos esse qui per Dei gratiam fiant obedientes atque permaneant, jam tamen fateantur, quod eorum præveniat voluntatem quibus datur hæc gratia. *Ibid.* lib. ii. cap. 41. [xvi].

[2] Pervenerunt autem isti fratres nostri, pro quibus solicita est pia charitas vestra, ut credant, cum Ecclesia Christi: peccato primi hominis obnoxium nasci genus humanum; nec ab isto malo, nisi per justitiam secundi hominis, aliquem liberari. Pervenerunt etiam, ut præveniri voluntates hominum Dei gratia fateantur, atque ut ad nullum opus bonum vel incipiendum vel perficiendum sibi quenquam sufficere posse consentiant. *Retenta ergo ista, in quæ pervenerunt, plurimum eos a Pelagianorum errore discernunt.* Proinde, si in eis ambulent et orent eum qui dat intellectum, si quid de Prædestinatione aliter sapiunt, ipse illis hoc quoque revelabit. Tamen etiam nos impendamus eis dilectionis affectum ministeriumque sermonis, sicut donat ille quem rogamus; ut, in his literis, ea, quæ illis essent apta et utilia, diceremus. August. *de Prædest. et Persever.* lib. i. cap. 2.

[3] Rom. ix. 20, 21.

present designed holiness as the *cause* and not as the *consequence* of election. And further, that it does away with the necessity for Divine grace in order first to personal holiness and ultimately to everlasting life, a truth most clearly revealed in Holy Scripture.

It is not absolutely necessary, however, that even if election according to the will of God followed upon the foresight of these things, it would be *effected* by them. *Effect* and *consequence*, though generally used promiscuously are not always synonymous terms. "The Institution of a Christian Man," published in 1537, certainly contemplates faith and obedience, not as the consequences, but as the causes of election. "There is, and hath been, even from the beginning of the world, and so shall endure and continue, a certain number, society, communion, or company of the elect and faithful people of God, of which number our Saviour Jesus Christ is the only head and governor, and the members of the same be all these holy saints, which be now in heaven, and also all the faithful people of God which be alive, or that ever heretofore have lived, or shall live in this world, from the beginning unto the end of the same and be ordained *for their true faith and obedience unto the will of God* to be saved, and to enjoy everlasting life in heaven."[1]

It seems clear that men cannot be said to be elected because their sins are less numerous or aggravated than those of others, for if this were the case election would have *appeared* at least to be of works, whereas the Apostle declares that God hath saved us and called us with an holy calling *not* according to our works, but according to His own purpose and grace, which was given to us in Christ Jesus before the world began";[2] and further, that "it is not of him that willeth nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy";[3] "Who hath given to Him and it shall be recompensed unto him again? For of Him, and through Him, and to Him are all things to whom be glory for ever. Amen."[4]

Neither can we assign foresight of faith and holiness to be the *cause* of election, for the following reasons:—

1. Because this would be making God to go out of Himself, so to speak, making Him look to this or that in the creature upon which His will may determine to act, and this is against the all-sufficiency of God's *knowledge*; as if it were possible for Him to obtain knowledge from the things we know. It is also against the all-sufficiency of God's *will*; as if it were possible for Him to be beholden to something in the creature before determining its election.

2. Because it makes God to choose us when we have chosen Him, and to love us when we have loved Him first, which is contrary to Scripture. 1 John iv. 19; v. 10.

[1] P. 13.
[2] 2 Tim. i. 9.
[3] Rom. ix. 16.
[4] Rom. xi. 35, 36.

3. Because it agrees not with the freedom of God's will. "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion." Rom. ix. 15, 16.

It must be fully admitted that election is founded upon grace or the good pleasure of God's will, and this in strictness is the only original *cause* and *motive* of election. But though there be no other *cause* or *motive* of election than the good pleasure of God's will, and it is founded only on grace, so that nothing foreseen in man *moved* God to proceed to election, yet God may well, according to the good pleasure of His will, fix upon foreseen obedience and faith as the *conditions* upon which He would elect. For though election always supposes an arbitrary power to select whom He will, in Him choosing, yet when an all-wise, just, holy and perfect God is the Person making the choice, it is only reasonable to infer that He will elect according *to His ways*, not *for their ways* or works which they have done as the *meritorious* cause of election, yet according to them as the equitable rule that His good pleasure forms to Himself in proceeding in election.[1] Election is still the *proper* and *sole* act of God, however His procedure in that act may be upon a foresight of obedience and faith or of fitness for the work of the Lord.

It is not likely that the Apostle would have spoken as he does of election had it originated in the worthiness of the chosen. It would not have been the cause of thanksgiving which it was had it rested on any such basis as foreseen worthiness. In the New Testament it is made a pre-eminent cause of thankfulness to God, for our election like our redemption is a work of pure grace—of undeserved favour. "But we are bound to give thanks always to God for you, brethren, beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation."[2] "We give thanks to God always for you all, knowing, brethren beloved, your election of God."[3] And again, "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ, according as He hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world, having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to Himself, *according to the good pleasure of His will*, to the praise of the glory of His grace."[4]

It has been thought that the difficulty might be partially solved

[1] "Faith foreseen" and "*from* faith foreseen," as the annotator to the Theses of Mr. Thos. Parker justly observes, "is one thing. The '*foreknowledge* of faith,' and '*according* to that foreknowledge,' is another (1 Pet. i. 2). For *faith* is an act of *our duty*. *Prescience* or *foreknowledge* is an act of Divine perfection. '*From* faith foreseen' marks the *cause*; '*according* to faith foreseen' marks the *order*. We deny that God's intention of the end or of our reward depends *upon faith foreseen* as upon the cause, but we affirm, with the sacred Scriptures, that it is formed *according to the Divine* prescience or foreknowledge."

[2] 2 Thess. ii. 13. [3] 2 Thess. i. 4. [4] Eph. i. 6.

by regarding the ecclesiastical election as an election of grace and the election of those who finally persevere in their baptismal grace and make their calling and election sure as an election of justice. For one is initial salvation—that is, in the one we are placed in a condition of salvation: the other regards the end, eternal life, as the result of salvation.

But this is hardly satisfactory. Clement of Alexandria and Jerome were not very consistent in the cause they assigned for election, regarding the Church as they did as the election—the congregation of those placed in a condition of salvation. And this inconsistency Arminius avoided by holding election to be of individuals directly to eternal life.

Mr. Faber[1] argues, that as many who are admitted within the pale of the visible church fall away from grace and die impenitent and unholy, therefore, the impelling cause of election of such unfit and unholy persons cannot be God's foreknowledge of their future fitness and holiness; for a foreknowledge of the fitness and holiness of those who are permanently unfit and unholy would be a direct contradiction. The Pseudo-Ambrose saw this difficulty and attempted to evade it by a division into two classes—one class elected *permanently* into the Church, the other class *not permanently*. He follows Clement of Alexandria in stating that God elected those whom He foreknew would be devoted to Him, or whom He foreknew would possess a fitness for their election, yet he says that God has elected some individuals into the Church *permanently*, because He foresaw that they would persevere in holiness and would thus attain eternal life; while other individuals He has elected indeed into the Church but not *permanently*, because He foresaw that through inaptitude they would not persevere in holiness and would thus fail of eternal life.[2] This is the first hint we find in the fathers of the modern doctrine of the visible and invisible Church as distinct, a doctrine we have already considered.[3]

This does not properly meet the argument of Mr. Faber above, but the reasoning of the latter gentleman is itself not quite satis-

[1] "The Primitive Doctrine of Election," p. 279.

[2] Hi autem secundum propositum vocantur, quos credentes præscivit Deus futuros sibi idoneos; ut antequam crederent, scirentur. Nam, quos præscivit, et prædestinavit. Istos, quos præscivit futuros sibi devotos, ipsos elegit ad promissa præmia capessenda; ut hi, qui credere videntur et non permanent in fide cœpta, a Deo electi negentur: quia, quos Deus elegit, apud se permanent. Est enim, qui ad tempus eligitur, sicut Saul et Judas, non de præscientia, sed de præsenti justitia. Quos autem prædestinavit, illos et vocavit; et, quos vocavit, ipsos et justificavit; quos autem justificavit, hos et magnificavit. Hoc dicit quod supra, quia, quos præscivit Deus aptos sibi, hi credentes permanent, quia aliter fieri non potest; nisi, quos præscivit Deus, ipsos et justificavit; ac, per hoc, et magnificavit illos, ut similes fiant Filio Dei. De cæteris, quos non præscivit Deus (scil. futuros sibi aptos), non est illi cura in hanc gratiam, quia non (scil. ita) præsciit. Ac si credant aut eligantur ad tempus quia videntur boni, ne justitia contempta videatur, non permanent ut magnificentur, sicut et Judas Scarioth, aut illi septuaginta duo, qui electi, post scandalum passi, recesserunt a Salvatore. Com. in Rom. viii. in Oper. Ambros. p. 1846-1847.

[3] Ante p. 188.

factory. There is in both a confounding between election as evidenced in baptism and as it exists in the mind of God from all eternity. It does not follow that because God knows that a man will ultimately be unfaithful, therefore he is not to be received into the Church on earth. The Lord might and no doubt does wisely ordain that the Gospel net shall catch both good and bad—and He has a purpose to work even in and by those who of their own perversity fall away and apostatize. This is a matter which must rest entirely with God, we, His finite creatures, cannot enter into His counsel here, but we may readily acknowledge that He has a purpose, yea a purpose of mercy too, to perform by the adoption of children who ultimately turn out to be reprobate.

Melancthon, in opposition to any fatalising scheme which denies altogether any exercise of free-will, asserts that although, in the strict and higher sense, man's worthiness is not the *moving cause* of his primary election, yet in a lower sense the *cause* of his secondary or complete election may be said to be in himself, since will or inclination on the part of the person elected must concur with the efficacious influence of the Holy Spirit, and since those alone are elected who by faith apprehend God's mercy and who do not ultimately cast away that confidence. There is much in this, and it is probably a very near approach to the truth.

God has not thought fit to reveal distinctly the reasons for His proceedings in the matter of election. It may be that He considered that such a revelation would not be conducive to the happiness of the creature nor be beneficial to him. His election, especially its cause, is to a certain extent a mystery: but are there not thousands of other mysteries to which we have no clue? Why was this world chosen as the spot wherein God was to create a being in His own likeness and image? Why was this spot in the Universe chosen for the Son of God to die and rise again? How will the resurrection be effected? How can bodies which have mouldered into dust centuries since, become instinct with life? How can the same body be raised again? Will children be raised as adults—young men as old men, or all as of a certain age? God has not thought fit to give us light on these subjects, and we may rest assured that it is best for us that we should remain in darkness. Let us rest confidently in His righteousness—His unspeakable justice and unfathomable love and mercy, and learn to be thankful for what He has revealed making the best use possible of this.

(*b*) *Testimony of the Old Testament.*

As in the case of the subjects of Election, so in the case of the moving cause, it is clear that the cause of the election of the Jews

as the chosen or elect people must find a parallel in that of the elect in this dispensation, and hence the importance of seeing whether under the Old Dispensation the cause of God's election is revealed.

Deut. iv. 37.

Because He loved thy fathers, therefore He chose their seed after them, *and brought thee out of His sight* (or *with his presence*) *with His mighty* (or *great*) *power out of Egypt.*

Deut. vii. 6-8.

For thou art an holy people unto the Lord thy God; the Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a special (or *peculiar*) *people unto Himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth.* The Lord did not set His love upon you, nor choose you, because ye were more in number than any people; for ye were the fewest of all people(s); but because the Lord loved (*or* loveth) you, and because He would keep the oath which He had sworn (*or* sware) unto your fathers, *hath the Lord brought you out with a mighty hand, and redeemed you out of the house of bondage from the hand of Pharaoh King of Egypt.*

Deut. ix. 4-6.

Speak not thou in thine heart, after that the Lord thy God hath cast (or *thrust*) *them out from before thee, saying, For my righteousness the Lord hath brought me in to possess this land, but* (or *whereas*) *for the wretchedness of these nations the Lord doth drive them out from before thee.* Not for thy righteousness, or for the uprighteousness of thine heart dost thou go (in) to possess the land; *but for the wickedness of these nations the Lord thy God doth drive them out from before thee, and that He may perform* (or *establish*) *the word which the Lord sware unto thy fathers* (*to*) *Abraham,* (*to*) *Isaac, and* (*to*) *Jacob. Understand* (or *know*) *therefore,* that the Lord thy God giveth thee not this good land to possess it for thy righteousness; for thou art a stiff-necked people.

Deut. x. 15, 16.

Only the Lord had a delight in thy fathers to love them, and He chose their seed after them, even you above all people(s), *as it is* (or *as at*) *this day. Circumcise therefore the foreskin of your heart, and be no more stiffnecked.*

1 Sam. xii. 22.

The Lord will not forsake His people for His great name's sake; because it hath pleased the Lord to make you His people (*or* a people unto Himself).

Psl. iv. 3.

The Lord hath set apart *him that is godly for Himself.*

Psl. l. 23.

To him that ordereth his conversation aright *will I shew the salvation of God.*

Psl. ciii. 17, 18.

But the mercy *of the Lord* is *from everlasting to everlasting upon them that fear Him, and His righteousness unto children's children* to such as keep His covenant and to those that remember His commandments (*or* precepts) to do them.

Isai. xlviii. 9-11.

For My name's sake *will I defer Mine anger,* and for My praise *will I refrain for thee, that I cut thee not off. Behold I have refined thee, but not with* (or *as*) *silver; I have chosen thee in the furnace of affliction.* For Mine own sake, (even) for Mine own sake, *will I do it: for how should My name be polluted* (or *profaned?*) *and I will not give My glory unto another* (*or* and My glory will I not give to another).

Jer. xxxi. 3.

I have loved thee with an everlasting love; therefore with loving kindness have I drawn thee.

Ezek. xx. 5-11.

Thus saith the Lord God: In the day when I chose Israel *and lifted up Mine hand unto the seed of the house of Jacob I made Myself known unto them in the land of Egypt, when I lifted up Mine hand unto them saying, I am the Lord your God: in the* (or *that*) *day* (*that*) *I lifted up Mine hand unto them to bring them forth* (*out*) *of the land of Egypt into a land that I had espied for them flowing with milk and honey which is the glory of all lands; then said I* (or *and I said*) *unto them, Cast ye away every man the abominations of his eyes, and defile not yourselves with the idols of Egypt. I am the Lord your God. But they rebelled against Me, and would not hearken unto Me: they did not every man cast away the abominations of their eyes, neither did they forsake the idols of Egypt: then I said, I will* (or *would*) *pour out my fury upon them, to accomplish My anger against them in the midst of the land of Egypt.* But I wrought for My name's sake *that it should not be polluted before the heathen* (or *profaned in the sight of the nations*) *among whom they were, in whose sight I made myself known unto them, in bringing them forth out of the land of Egypt. Therefore* (OR *so*) *I caused them to go forth out of the land of Egypt, and brought them into the wilderness, and I gave them My statutes, and shewed them My judgments,* which if a man do, he shall even live in them.

Hosea ii. 23.

I will have mercy upon her that had not obtained mercy; *and I will say to them which were not My people, Thou art My people, and they shall say, Thou art my God.*

Mal. i. 2, 3.

I have loved you, saith the Lord, yet ye say wherein hast Thou loved us? Was not Esau Jacob's brother? saith the Lord: yet I loved Jacob, and I hated Esau (*or* but Esau I hated).

(c) *Testimony of the New Testament.*

The following are passages from the New Testament showing the cause of election to be as we have already stated. Some, we shall find, place the cause apparently in the absolute will and sovereignty of God irrespective of the actions of the creature, while others show that His election is not irrespective of His foreknowledge of the actions of those elected. We may here refer to a statement of Dr. Graves, which it will be well to keep in mind during this investigation. He says that on the whole review of the law, the prophets and the evangelists, we may affirm that the principle of impartial discriminative justice, as human reason understands that attribute, regulates the judgment of God towards man, through the entire series of the Divine dispensations, from the creation of the world to the last great day of final retribution, and that the scheme of absolute predestination (that is, as taught by Calvin), if inconsistent with the exercise of this great attribute (an inconsistency which some of its ablest patrons, though indirectly and reluctantly, yet appear compelled to admit), must be rejected as repugnant to the character and the word of God.

Matt. xvi. 27.

μέλλει γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεσθαι ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ, καὶ τότε ἀποδώσει ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὴν πρᾶξιν αὐτοῦ.

For the Son of Man shall come in the glory of His Father with His angels; and then He shall reward every man according to his works.

This is decisive that the Lord will reward every man according to his work—not according to an eternal decree of unconditional election or reprobation.

In the xxiv. and xxv. chapters of the same Gospel the day referred to is also mentioned, "When He shall come in power and great glory to judge the world," and it is declared that "then shall the Son of Man send His angels and they shall gather together His elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other." The context shows that the elect referred to could not have been marked out as such by an unconditional and irreversible decree irrespective of their conduct and character. For our Lord warns His disciples to "watch,"[1] declaring they shall be blessed or condemned according as they are found doing their

[1] Matt. xxiv. 42-51.

duty like wise and faithful servants. He shows this in the parable of the wise and foolish virgins,[1] and in the parable of the talents,[2] illustrating the truth in the most clear and concise way, and finally declaring that "when the Son of Man shall come in His glory and all the holy angels with Him, then shall He sit on the throne of His glory and before Him shall be gathered all nations, and He shall separate them one from the other as a shepherd divideth His sheep from the goats, and He shall set the sheep on His right hand, but the goats on His left. Then shall the King say unto them on His right hand, Come ye blessed of My Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world; for I was an hungered and ye gave Me meat; I was thirsty and ye gave Me drink; I was a stranger and ye took Me in; naked and ye clothed Me; I was sick and ye visited Me; I was in prison and ye came unto Me." For "inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these My brethren, ye have done it unto Me." While to those on His left hand He shall say, "Depart from Me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels, for I was an hungered and ye gave Me no meat; I was thirsty and ye gave Me no drink; I was a stranger and ye took Me not in, naked and ye clothed Me not, sick and in prison and ye visited Me not." For "inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these ye did it not to Me, and these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous unto life eternal."[3]

The eternal destiny of each one is here shown to be founded by a just judgment on the voluntary use each has made during the time of probation of the various talents entrusted to him by God. There is nothing to show that it was founded on an eternal decree of predestination, though of course God must have foreknown the ultimate destiny of each individual. It is expressly said to be founded on the use or abuse of grace, or the fruits thereof respectively, and there is not the slightest hint of unconditional decrees, of fixed necessity, or irresistible grace.

It is worthy of note, too, that though the kingdom was prepared for those who inherit it from the foundation of the earth, yet the fire into which the wicked pass is not said to have been prepared for them, but for the *devil and his angels*—election to life foreknown, no reprobation to death prepared for. Hence the assertion of Irenæus (ad. Hæres. lib. iv. c. 76) Deus autem omnia præsciens utrisque aptas præparavit habitationes, &c., must be understood in a qualified sense. So the words to those on the right hand are, "Blessed of My Father," but to those on the left not "cursed of My Father" because all man's salvation is of *God*, all his condemnation *from himself*.

In other passages of the Gospel we find the same truth of the just judgment of God. It is declared that the "hour is coming, in

[1] Matt. xxv. 1. [2] Matt. xxv. 14. [3] Matt. xxv. 31-36.

the which all that are in the graves shall hear His voice, and shall come forth, they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation."[1] And it is further taught that the opportunities of obtaining light, and the nature of the difficulties and trials in each particular case will be taken into consideration, all evincing that "the Judge of the earth doeth right." "That servant," says our Lord, "which knew his Master's will and prepared not, neither did according to His will, shall be beaten with many stripes; but he that knew not and did commit things worthy of stripes shall be beaten with few. And unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required, and to whom men commit much, of him they will ask the more."[2]

Acts x. 34, 35.

Ἐπ' ἀληθείας καταλαμβάνομαι ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι προσωπολήπτης ὁ Θεός· ἀλλ' ἐν παντὶ ἔθνει ὁ φοβούμενος αὐτὸν καὶ ἐργαζόμενος δικαιοσύνην δεκτὸς αὐτῷ ἐστι.

Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons, *but in* every nation *he that feareth Him and worketh righteousness is acceptable to Him.*

Peter in these verses does not mean simply—if at all, which is doubtful—that each heathen's natural light and uprightness renders him acceptable to God: but he shows that the point which had been previously troubling him was here solved—that point was the admissibility of all men into the Church of Christ. He perceives that in every nation those who seek after God and walk uprightly and honestly in the light vouchsafed to them, have no extraneous hindrance placed in their way, such as circumcision, but are capable of being admitted to the blessings of the Gospel, though Gentiles and as Gentiles. The passage hardly affects the subject of election, except that it is opposed to an irrespective decree.

Rom. ii. 6-11.

ὃς ἀποδώσει ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ· τοῖς μὲν καθ' ὑπομονὴν ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν ζητοῦσι, ζωὴν αἰώνιον· τοῖς δὲ ἐξ ἐριθείας, καὶ ἀπειθοῦσι τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πειθομένοις δὲ τῇ ἀδικίᾳ ὀργὴ καὶ θυμὸς, θλῖψις καὶ στενοχωρία, ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ψυχὴν ἀνθρώπου τοῦ κατεργαζομένου τὸ κακὸν, Ἰουδαίου τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἕλληνος· δόξα δὲ καὶ τιμὴ καὶ εἰρήνη παντὶ τῷ ἐργαζομένῳ τὸ ἀγαθόν, Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἕλληνι· οὐ γάρ ἐστι προσωποληψία παρὰ τῷ θεῷ.

Who will render to every man according to his deeds; to them who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory and honour, and incorruption, eternal life; but to them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil, of the Jew first, and also of the

[1] John v. 28, 29. [2] Luke xii. 47, 48.

Greek, but glory, honour, and peace to every man that worketh good, to the Jew first, and also to the Greek, for there is no respect of persons with God.

Rom. ix. 11, 12.

The children being not yet born, neither having done anything good or bad that the purpose of God according to election might stand not of works, but of Him that calleth, *it was said unto her, the elder shall serve the younger.*

This passage has already been examined at length,[1] and it is cited here simply for its distinct enunciation of the truth that election is *not of works*, but of Him that calleth. The children of Rebecca not having done either good or evil to the end that the purpose of God according to election may stand, not depending on works, but on Him that calleth, it was said to her the elder shall serve the younger. The words "not depending on works but on Him that calleth," do not seem to depend on any one word of the foregoing or following, either on ἐῤῥήθη or μένη, or κατ' ἐκλογήν, but to be a general characteristic of the whole transaction, and the passage is certainly decisive against the Pelagianism of those who by making our faith, as foreseen by God, the cause of our election affirm it to be ἐξ ἔργων.

Rom. ix. 15, 16, 18.

For He saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I have compassion. So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth but of God that hath mercy. . . . *So then hath* He mercy on whom He will, *and whom He will He hardeneth.*

This text also has been already examined.[2] The quotation of the first part of this text is from the Seventy who insert the indefinite ἄν. It seems that the meaning more properly is as pointed out by Dean Alford, "whenever I have mercy on any it shall be *pure mercy*, no human desert contributing, which agrees better with the next verse than the ordinary rendering, which lays the stress on the ὅν ἄν; and is not inconsistent with verse 18, ὅν θέλει, ἐλεεῖ; because if God's mercy be *pure mercy*, without any desert on man's part, it necessarily follows that He has mercy on whom He will, His will being the only assignable cause of the selection."[3] On the 16th verse the same learned commentator says, "I must pause again here to remind the student that I purposely do not enter on the disquisitions so abundant in some commentaries on this part of scripture, by which it is endeavoured to reconcile the sovereign election of God with our free will. We shall find that free will asserted strongly enough for all edifying purposes by this Apostle when the time comes, at present he is employed wholly in asserting the Divine sovereignty, the glorious vision of which

[1] Ante pp. 200 and 208. [2] Ante p. 212. [3] Alford's Greek Test., Rom. ix. 15.

it ill becomes us to distract by continual downward looks on this earth."

Rom. xi. 5, 6.

Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace. But if by grace then is it no more of works: *otherwise grace is no more grace.*

This passage has already been examined, and is only cited here as it bears on the cause of election.

1 Cor. i. 26—29.

Βλέπετε γὰρ τὴν κλῆσιν ὑμῶν, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι οὐ πολλοὶ σοφοὶ κατὰ σάρκα, οὐ πολλοὶ δυνατοί, οὐ πολλοὶ εὐγενεῖς· ἀλλὰ τὰ μωρὰ τοῦ κόσμου ἐξελέξατο ὁ Θεὸς, ἵνα καταισχύνῃ τοὺς σοφούς καὶ τὰ ἀσθενῆ τοῦ κόσμου ἐξελέξατο ὁ Θεὸς, ἵνα καταισχύνῃ τὰ ἰσχυρά· καὶ τὰ ἀγενῆ τοῦ κόσμου καὶ τὰ ἐξουθενημένα ἐξελέξατο ὁ Θεός, καὶ τὰ μὴ ὄντα, ἵνα τὰ ὄντα καταργήσῃ· ὅπως μὴ καυχήσηται πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ.

For behold your calling, *brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called: but God chose the foolish things of the world that He might put to shame the wise; and God chose the weak things of the world that He might put to shame the things which are mighty; and the base things of the world, and the things which are despised, God chose, yea, and the things which are not, to bring to nought the things that are*: that no flesh should glory in the presence of God.

Gal. i. 15.

Ὅτε δὲ εὐδόκησεν ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ἀφορίσας με ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου καὶ καλέσας διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ.

But when it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me through His grace.

Rückert understands by καλέσας the act in the Divine mind: but this is a mistake. It is contrary to the Apostle's usage of the word (see verse 6, and Rom. viii. 30).

Eph. i. 3—12.

Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in the heavenly places in Christ; even as He chose *us in Him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before Him in love; having* predestinated *us unto adoption as children by Jesus Christ to Himself,* according to the good pleasure of His will . . . . *having made known unto us the mystery of His will,* according to His good pleasure *which He (hath) purposed in Himself . . . . in Whom also we were made an heritage having been* predestinated according to the purpose of Him who worketh all things after the counsel of His will, *that we should be to the praise of His glory, who had before hoped in Christ.*

These passages have been already considered under different aspects. The only point we propose here to observe on is the force of the words "according to the good pleasure of His will;" "according to His good pleasure which He hath purposed in Himself;" "predestinated according to the purpose of Him who worketh all things after the counsel of His will." On the words, "according to the good pleasure," Dean Alford remarks, "It is disputed whether εὐδοκία has here merely the general meaning of *beneplacitum*, or that of *benevolentia*." Hare (see also Ellicott) examines thoroughly the use of the word by the LXX, and decides in favour of the latter, alleging, especially, that a mere assertion of doctrine would be out of place in an ascription of thanksgiving. But surely this is a most unfortunate position. The facts on which doctrines rest are here the very subject of the Apostle's thanksgiving; and the strict parallels of Matt. xi. 26, Luke x. 21, should have kept Hare from adducing it. Granting, as we must, *both senses* to εὐδοκεῖν and εὐδοκία, the context must in each case determine which is meant. And its testimony here is clear. It is as De Witte remarks, not in προωρισμένοι, but in προορίσας, that the object to which εὐδοκία refers, is to be sought, and the subsequent recurrences of the same idea in verse 9 and verse 11 point out that it is not the Father's *benevolentia*, but His *beneplacitum* which is in the Apostle's mind. And so Meyer, Steer, and Ellicott. This *beneplacitum* was *benevolentia*, verse 6; but that does not affect the question. In the 11th verse the βουλή answers to the εὐδοκία of verse 5—the definite shape which the will assumes when decided to action—implying in this case the union of sovereign will with infinite wisdom.[1]

Col. iii. 24, 25.

Εἰδότες ὅτι ἀπὸ Κυρίου ἀπολήψεσθε τὴν ἀνταπόδοσιν τῆς κληρονομίας· τῷ Κυρίῳ Χριστῷ δουλεύετε. ὁ γὰρ ἀδικῶν κομιεῖται ὃ ἠδίκησε· καὶ οὐκ ἔστι προσωποληψία.

Knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance; ye serve the Lord Christ. For he that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong which he hath done: and there is no respect of persons.

2 Tim. i. 9.

Τοῦ σώσαντος ἡμᾶς καὶ καλέσαντος κλήσει ἁγίᾳ, οὐ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα ἡμῶν, ἀλλὰ κατ' ἰδίαν πρόθεσιν καὶ χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσαν ἡμῖν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων.

Who saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, *which was given us in Christ Jesus before times eternal.*

This is one of the texts on which the fifth section of Chapter III. of the Westminster Confession is founded—the statement being that the decree of God is of His mere free grace and love, without

[1] Alford, Greek Test., Ed. 1888, vol. 3, p. 78.

any foresight of faith or good works or perseverance either of them or any other thing in the creature as conditions or causes moving Him thereunto. But it seems to be ignored that there may be conditions without being causes, and the two are mixed up together here. Bishop Reynolds,[1] a strong Calvinist, admits this difference. "Our goodness is not the motive of His love, but His love the fountain of our goodness. None, indeed, are healed and saved, but those who repent and return; but repentance is only a condition, and that freely given by God, disposing the subject for salvation; not a cause moving or procuring God to save us. It is necessary as the means to the end, not as the cause to the effect." It must be remembered that the Apostle is not, in the verse under consideration, referring to the selection of individuals by a call of irresistible grace to salvation in a future condition, but to the admission of the Gentiles into the Church of Christ on earth. This was no doubt totally irrespective of any works on their part meriting such a favour, and solely in consequence of the Divine purpose ordained from before the foundation of the world, but it does not warrant so broad a statement as that conditions are not required to be performed by those who would obtain the reward, which is the gracious result of the call.

Heb. vi. 9, 10.

πεπείσμεθα δὲ περὶ ὑμῶν, ἀγαπητοι, τὰ κρείττονα καὶ ἐχόμενα σωτηρίας, εἰ καὶ οὕτω λαλοῦμεν· οὐ γὰρ ἄδικος ὁ θεὸς ἐπιλαθέσθαι τοῦ ἔργου ὑμῶν, καὶ τῆς ἀγάπης ἧς ἐνεδείξασθε εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ διακονήσαντες τοῖς ἁγίοις καὶ διακονοῦντες.

But, beloved, we are persuaded better things of you, and things that accompany salvation, though we thus speak; for God is not unrighteous to forget your work and the love, which ye shewed toward His name, in that ye ministered to the saints, and do minister.

The writer of this Epistle therefore did not consider that God had no respect to their work and labour of love. And when in the same chapter he says "and we desire that each one of you may show the same diligence to the full assurance of hope unto the end that ye be not slothful, but followers of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises," he implies more clearly that in the absence of "faith and patience" the promises are not inherited.

1 Pet. i. 17.

Καὶ εἰ πατέρα ἐπικαλεῖσθε τὸν ἀπροσωπολήπτως κρίνοντα κατὰ τὸ ἑκάστου ἔργον, ἐν φόβῳ τὸν τῆς παροικίας ὑμῶν χρόνον ἀναστράφητε.

And if ye call on Him as Father, who without respect of persons judgeth according to each man's work, *pass the time of your sojourning in fear.*

[1] Sermon iv.

It is clear from this that St. Peter thought that the fate of the elect would be decided not according to any absolute decree, but according to their obedience or disobedience to the holy precepts of the Gospel. If ye call upon *as Father* πατέρα, not "the Father," but using the word predicatively and prefixing it, for emphasis, Him who judgeth impartially.[1] The Apostle shows that those who call upon God their Father acknowledging that they are strangers and pilgrims here, where they find no abiding place, must walk in fear: not the φόβος καταρκτικός leading to repentance, but the φόβος τελειωτικός which accompanies the Christian through the whole course of his life.

Rev. iii. 4.

Ἔχεις ὀλίγα ὀνόματα ἐν Σάρδεσιν, ἃ οὐκ ἐμόλυναν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν· καὶ περιπατήσουσι μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν λευκοῖς, ὅτι ἄξιοί εἰσιν.

Thou hast a few names in Sardis which did not defile their garments; and they shall walk with me in white: for they are worthy.

The ἀξιότης here is seen in the very terms of the passage. They have *kept their garments undefiled;* they are those who here in humility have walked with Jesus clothed with His righteousness which He has made theirs, and their reward is to walk in bright array in the glorious mansions above. Worthiness does not necessarily imply goodness or even merit in the individuals themselves further than that they have become the proper recipients of the goodness of God. It does however imply, and indeed express, that they have been faithful in what was intrusted to them. The garment was the gift of God, and it was by His grace unresisted that it was kept undefiled.

(*d*) *Testimony of the Early Church.*

Vossius, who was intimately acquainted with all the early Christian writers, says in the 6th book of his Pelagian history, "The Greek Fathers always, and all the Latin Fathers who lived before Augustine, are wont to say that those men are predestinated to life whom God foresaw would live piously and well, or as some others speak, whom God foresaw would believe and persevere, etc.; which they so interpret that predestination unto glory is made according to God's foreknowledge of faith and perseverance. But they did not mean the foreknowledge of such things which a man was to do by the power of nature, but by the strength of prevenient and subsequent grace. Therefore, this consent of antiquity is of no service to the Pelagians or semi-Pelagians, who both hold that a reason of predestination in all its effects may be assigned from something in us; whereas, the Orthodox Fathers acknowledge

[1] See Alford, Greek Test., on passage.

that the first grace is not conferred of merit, but freely: so that they thought no reason from anything in us could be given of predestination to prevenient grace."[1]

The following quotations show the various views of early writers.

Clement of Rome.

They were all, therefore, glorified and magnified, not through themselves or through their works, or through the righteousness which they wrought, but through His will. We therefore, also, who were called through His will in Christ Jesus, are not justified by ourselves, neither by our own wisdom or understanding or piety, or the works which we wrought in holiness of heart; but by that faith by which Almighty God has justified all men from the beginning: to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen.[2]

Ignatius.

He asserts that predestination is founded upon "*the will of the Father and of Jesus Christ our God.*"[3]

Hermas.

He asserts that God founded the Church of the Elect *by His own powerful or sovereign might.*[4]

Irenæus.

If, therefore, in the present time also, God has, as to all those whom He knows will not believe, since He foreknows all things, given them over to their unbelief and turned away His face from men of this stamp, leaving them in the darkness which they have chosen for themselves, what is there wonderful if He did also at that time give over to their unbelief Pharaoh, who never would have believed, along with those who were with him?[5]

God foreknowing all things has prepared suitable habitations for both (*i.e.* for the good and for the bad).[6]

We were predestinated when as yet we had no existence, according to the foreknowledge of the Father.[7]

[1] Bishop Andrews, himself a moderate Calvinist, says, "I dare not condemn the Fathers, who almost all assert that we are elected and predestinated according to faith foreseen."

[2] πάντες οὖν ἐδοξάσθησαν καὶ ἐμεγαλύνθησαν, οὐ δι' αὐτῶν, ἢ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῶν, ἢ τῆς δικαιοπραγίας ἧς κατειργάσαντο, ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἡμεῖς οὖν διὰ θελήματος αὐτοῦ ἐν Κριστῷ Ἰησοῦ κληθέντες, οὐ δι' ἑαυτῶν δικαιούμεθα, οὐδὲ διὰ τῆς ἡμετέρας σοφίας, ἢ συνέσεως, ἢ εὐσεβείας, ἢ ἔργων ὧν κατειργασάμεθα ἐν ὁσιότητι καρδίας· ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς πίστεως, δι' ἧς πάντας τοῦ ἀπ' αἰῶνος ὁ παντοκράτωρ Θεὸς ἐδικαίωσεν· ᾧ ἔστω ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν. Clem. Rom., Ep. ad Cor., i. § 32.

[3] Epist. ad. Ephes. § 1, see extract, ante p. 225.

[4] Past. lib. i. vis. i. § 3, see extract, ante p. 225.

[5] Si igitur et nunc, quotquot scit non credituros Deus, cum sit omnium præcognitor, tradidit eos infidelitati eorum, et avertit faciem ab hujusmodi, relinquens eos in tenebris, quas ipsi sibi elegerunt: quid mirum si et tunc nunquam crediturum Pharaonem, cum his qui cum eo erant, tradidit eos suæ infidelitati? Iren. *adv. Hæres.* lib. iv. c. 48.

[6] Deus autem, omnia præsciens, utriusque aptas præparavit habitationes. Ib. lib. iv. c. 76.

[7] Prædestinati quidem ut essemus, qui nondum eramus, secundum præscientiam Patris. Ib. lib. v. cap. 1.

Clement of Alexandria.

We say: that there is only one ancient and Catholic Church, which into the unity of one faith, that is according to its proper covenants, or rather according to its single covenant, evolved in different times, collects together, by the will of the one God through one Lord, those already ordained, *whom God predestinated as knowing before the foundation of the world, that they would be just.*[1]

Origen.

In the great house of this world there are not only golden and silver vessels, but also wooden and earthen ones, and some are to honour and others to dishonour; both, however, are necessary. But since these vessels of which we speak are to be considered as rational, and endowed with free will, every one is made either a vessel of honour or a vessel of dishonour, not by accident or chance, but he who shows himself such that he deserves to be chosen, is made a chosen vessel or a vessel of honour. But he who lives under the influence of unworthy or the lowest senses is formed a vessel of dishonour, *the causes of his dishonour arising not from the Creator, but from himself.*[2]

All these things look this way, that the Apostle may prove that, "that if either Isaac or Jacob, for their merits, had been chosen by God to those things which they, being in the flesh, sought after, and, by the works of the flesh, had deserved to be justified; they would have been able, at any rate by reason of their merits, to reach to the posterity of flesh and blood also, but now, since *their election does not arise from works, but from the purpose of God*, from the will of Him that calleth.[3]

Hilary of Poictiers.

Because many are called, and few chosen; there is not therefore a lack in the number of the invited, but a scarcity in the chosen; for in inviting without exception, there is the humanity of public

[1] Μόνην εἶναι φαμὲν ἀρχαίαν καὶ καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν, εἰς ἑνότητα πίστεως μιᾶς τῆς κατὰ τὰς οἰκείας διαθήκας, μᾶλλον δὲ κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην τὴν μιάν διαφόροις τοῖς χρόνοις, ἑνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τῷ βουλήματι δι' ἑνὸς τοῦ Κυρίου συνάγουσαν τοὺς ἤδη καπατεταγμένους, οὓς προώρισεν ὁ Θεὸς, δικαίους ἐσομένους πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου ἐγνωκώς. Clemt. of Alex. Strom. lib. vii. § 17.

[2] In magna enim hac mundi hujus domo non sunt tantummodo vasa aurea, et argentea, sed et lignea et fictilia et alia quidem ad honorem, alia autem ad contumeliam, utraque tamen necessaria. Verum quoniam vasa hæc quæ dicimus, rationabilia intelligenda sunt, et liberi arbitrii; non casu, neque fortuitu, unusquisque aut vas honoris efficitur, aut vas contumeliæ, sed qui se talem præbuerit, ut electus esse mereatur, vas electum, et vas honoris efficitur. Qui vero indignis et deterrimis sensibus vivit, iste formatur vas contumeliæ, non à conditore, sed à semetipso causis contumeliæ suæ datis. Origen in Numeros. Hom. xiv.

[3] Hæc omnia eo spectant, ut illud probet Apostolus, quod si vel Isaac, vel Jacob, pro his meritis electi fuissent a Deo, quæ in carne positi acquisierant, et per opera carnis justificari meruissent, possent utique meriti eorum gratia ad posteritatem carnis quoque et sanguinis pertinere. Nunc vero, cum electio eorum non ex operibus facta sit, sed ex proposito Dei, et ex vocantis arbitrio. Origen in Ep. ad Rom. Com. lib. vii.

goodness; but in the invited, by a meritorious judgment, *the election of probity.*[1]

The elect are conspicuous in the wedding garment, and splendid in the pure and perfect body of the new birth, wherefore election is not a thing of indiscriminate judgment, but the distinction is made *from the consideration of merit.*[2]

Ambrose.

On the text in Matt. xx. 23, 'To sit on My right hand and on My left, is not Mine to give,' he observes—"He has not said, it is not Mine *to give,* but it is not Mine to give *to you;*" not asserting that He wanted power, but the creatures merit. Take it otherwise: *It is not Mine to give you;* that is, it is not Mine, who came to teach humility; it is not Mine who came not to be ministered unto, but to minister; it is not Mine, who keep righteous, not grace. Moreover referring to the Father, He added, *for whom it hath been prepared;* that He might show that the Father also does not pay regard to petitions, but to merits, for God is no acceptor of persons. Hence also the Apostle says, *whom He hath foreknown He also predestinated,* for He did not predestinate before He foreknew, but those *whose merits He foreknew their rewards He predestinated.*[3]

Jerome.

'If ye have been willing and obedient ye shall eat the good things of the land, but if ye have refused and been disobedient and provoked Me to wrath ye shall be devoured with the sword, for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it' (Is. i. 19, 20). He preserves free will that either way there may be either punishment or reward, not from an antecedent decree of God, but according to the merit of every individual.[4]

The goodness and clemency of God hardens the vessels of wrath which are fitted to destruction, that is to say, the people of Israel; but the vessels of mercy which He has prepared for glory and which He has called, that is to say, us who are not only of the

[1] Quia multi vocati sunt, et pauci electi. Non est igitur paucitas in invitatis, sed raritas in electis; quia in invitante sine exceptione publicæ bonitatis humanitas est; in invitatis vero de judicii merito probitatis electio est. Hilar. Com. in Matt. cap. xxii.

[2] Electi autem sunt nuptiali veste conspicui, puro atque integro novæ nativitatis corpore splendidi. Itaque non res indiscreti judicii electio est; sed ex meriti delectu facta discretio est. Hil. Tract. in Psal. lxiv.

[3] Non dixit, Non est meum dare; sed, *non est meum dare vobis,* hoc est, non sibi potestatem deesse adserens, sed meritum creaturis. Accipe aliter: *Non est meum dare vobis.* Quod est, *non est meum,* qui veni humilitatem docere; *non est meum,* qui veni non ministrari, sed ministrare; *non est meum,* qui justitiam servo, non gratiam. Denique ad Patrem referens, addidit: *Quibus paratum est;* ut ostenderet Patrem quoque non petitionibus deferre solere, sed meritis, quia Deus personarum acceptor non est. Unde et Apostolus ait: *Quos* præscivit, et prædestinavit; non enim ante prædestinavit, quam præsciret; sed quorum merita præscivit, eorum præmia prædestinavit. Ambrose, *de Fide,* lib. v. cap. vi. §§ 81-3.

[4] Si volueritis et audieritis, bona terræ comedetis; si nolueritis et non audieritis et me ad iracundiam provocaveritis gladius devorabit vos. Quia os Domini loquutum est. Liberum servat arbitrium; ut in utramque partem non ex præjudicio Dei, sed ex meritis singulorum, vel pœna vel præmium sit. Jerome, Com. lib. 1. In Isa. Proph. cap. 1.

Jews but also of the Gentiles. He saves not without reason and without truth of judgment, but from preceding causes, namely, because some received not the Son of God but others willingly received Him of their own accord. These vessels of mercy are, not only the people of the Gentiles, but likewise those who out of the Jews have been willing to believe, for the two were made one people of believers. Whence it is shown, that not nations are chosen but the wills of men.[1]

The love and hatred of God [as illustrated by the Apostle in the case of Jacob and Esau] spring either from His foreknowledge of things future, or from men's works. Otherwise we know that God loves all things, nor hates any of the things which He created, but that He properly claims for the exercise of His love those who are enemies and opponents of vice, and on the contrary, He hates those who commence to build up again what God has destroyed.[2]

Augustine.

Now because he said, 'For the children being not yet born neither having done any good or evil that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works but of Him that calleth, it was said unto her, 'The elder shall serve the younger, as it is written, Jacob have I loved but Esau have I hated' (Rom. ix. 11-13), some have been induced to think that the Apostle Paul has taken away free will through which we obtain the favour of God by the good of piety, or offend Him with the evil of impiety. For they say that previous to any works either good or bad of two persons not yet born God loved the one, and hated the other. But we answer that this was done by the prescience of God, by which He knew even concerning those who are not yet born what sort of a person each would be. But lest anyone should say, Therefore God has chosen works in him whom He loved, although they did not yet exist, because He foreknew what they would be, but if He chose works, how says the Apostle, that the election was not made of works? Wherefore it is to be understood that good works are done through love, but that love is in us through the

[1] Bonitas et clementia Dei, vasa iræ, quæ apta sunt in interitum, id est, populum Israel, indurat: vasa autem misericordiæ, quæ præparavit in gloriam, quæ vocavit, hoc est, nos, qui non solum ex Judæis sumus sed etiam ex gentibus, non salvat irrationabiliter et absque judicii veritate, sed causis præcedentibus; quia alii non susceperunt Filium Dei, alii autem recipere sua sponte voluerunt. Hæc autem vasa misericordiæ non solum populus gentium est; sed etiam hi qui ex Judæis credere voluerunt: et unus credentium effectus est populus. Ex quo ostenditur; non gentes eligi, sed hominum voluntates. Hieron. ad Hedib. Epist. quæst. 10.

[2] Dilectio et odium Dei, vel ex præscientia nascitur futurorum, vel ex operibus: alioquin novimus, quod omnia Deus diligat, nec quidquam eorum oderit quæ creavit; sed propriè eos suæ vindicet charitati, qui vitiorum hostes sunt et rebelles; et, e contrario, illos odit qui a Deo destructa cœpiunt rursum extruere. Hieron. Com. in Mal. i. 2, 3.—There are passages in the Commentary on the Proverbs and the Epistle to the Romans attributed to St. Jerome, but these have not been cited on account of the doubt as to their true authorship. See Rivet, Critic. Sacr. lib. iv. c. 5; Voss, Hist. Pelag. lib. i. cap. 9; James's *Corruptions of the Fathers*, ed. 1612, 33, 37; Perkins's Problem, ed. 1609, 564.

gift of the Holy Ghost, as the same Apostle says, 'The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost, which is given unto us' (Rom. v. 5). Therefore, no one ought to glory in his works as if they were his own, which he has by the gift of God, since love itself works in him that which is good. What then has God chosen? For if He gives the Holy Spirit to whom He wills, by whom love works good, how has He chosen to whom He gives it? For if by merit, there is no election, for all are equal before merit; nor can it be called election where things are exactly equal. But since the Holy Spirit is not given except to those who believe, God has not chosen the works which He Himself gives, when He gives the Holy Spirit that we may do good works through love: but nevertheless He has chosen faith. Because, except every one believes in Him and continues in the will of receiving, he does not receive the gift of God, that is the Holy Ghost, by means of whom he may be able to do good works, the love of God being shed abroad. Therefore God has not chosen in His prescience the works of anyone, which He Himself is about to give; but He hath chosen faith in His prescience, so that He chose him whom He foreknew would believe on Himself, to whom He might give His Holy Spirit, that by performing good works he might also obtain eternal life.[1]

Nobody is chosen, unless already differing from him that is rejected. From what has been said I do not see how it can be said that 'God has chosen us before the beginning of the world,' unless this is said with respect to God's foreknowledge of our faith and works of piety.[2]

[1] Quod autem ait, Nondum enim nascentium, neque agentium aliquid boni aut mali, ut secundum electionem propositum Dei maneret, non ex operibus, sed ex vocante dictum est ei, quia major serviet minori, sicut scriptum est. Jacob dilexi Esau autem odio habui, nonnullos movet, ut putent apostolum Paulum abstulisse liberum voluntatis arbitrium, quo promeremur Deum bono pietatis, vel malo impietatis offendimus. Dicunt enim, quod ante opera aliqua, seu bona seu mala, duorum nondum nascentium Deus unum dilexerit, alterum odio habuerit. Sed respondemus, præscientiâ Dei factum esse, qua novit etiam de nondum natis, qualis quisque futurus sit. Sed ne quis dicat, opera ergo elegit Deus in eo quem dilexit, quamquam nondum erant, quod erant futura præsciebat: quod si opera elegit, quomodo dicit apostolus, non ex operibus factam electionem? Propter ea ergo intelligendum est, opera bona per dilectionem fieri, dilectionem autem esse in nobis per donum Spiritus-Sancti, sicut idem apostolus dicit, caritas Dei diffusa est in cordibus nostris per Spiritum-Sanctum qui datus est nobis. Non ergo quisquam gloriari debet ex operibus tamquam suis, quæ per donum Dei habet, cum ipsa dilectio in eo bonum operetur. Quid ergo elegit Deus? Si enim cui vult donat Spiritum-Sanctum, per quem dilectio bonum operatur, quomodo elegit cui donet? Si enim nullo merito, non est electio, æquales enim omnes sunt ante meritum, nec potest in rebus omnino æqualibus electio nominari. Sed quoniam Spiritus-Sanctus non datur nisi credentibus, non quidem Deus elegit opera quæ ipse largitur, cum dat Spiritum-Sanctum, ut per caritatem bona operemur: sed tamen elegit fidem. Quia nisi quisque credat in eum, et in accipiendi voluntate permaneat, non accipit donum Dei, id est, Spiritum-Sanctum, per quem diffusa caritate bonum possit operari. Non ergo elegit Deus opera cujusquam in præscientia, quæ ipse daturus est; sed fidem elegit in præscientia: ut quem sibi crediturum esse præscivit ipsum elegerit, cui Spiritum-Sanctum daret, ut bona operando etiam vitam æternam consequeretur. August. *Prop. ex Ep. ad Rom.* Exp. lx.

[2] Nemo eligitur nisi jam distans ab illo qui rejicitur. Unde quod dictum est, elegit nos Deus ante mundi constitutionem, non video quomodo sit dictum nisi de præscientiâ fidei et operum pietatis. August. *Quæst.* ii. *ad Simplicianum.*

Chrysostom.

The being called and purified was of grace, but that the person called and made pure should continue so, depends upon the diligence of those who are called. *The being called does not proceed from merit, but from grace.*[1]

On the words, "Come ye blessed of My Father, &c.," he says: What honour! what blessedness do these words contain! For He does not say receive, but inherit, as your property, as your Father's, as yours, as due to you from above; for before you were born, these things, says He, had been prepared and made ready for you, for I knew you would be such.[2]

[1] "Οτι τὸ μὲν κληθῆναι καὶ καθαρθῆναι χάριτος ἦν· τὸ δὲ κληθέντα καὶ καθαρὰ ἐνδυσάμενον μεῖναι τοιαῦτα διατηροῦντα τῆς τῶν κληθέντων σπουδῆς. Τὸ κληθῆναι δὲ οὐκ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀξίας γέγονεν, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τῆς χάριτος. Chrysos. in Matt. Hom. lxix. § 3.

[2] Πόσης ταῦτα τιμῆς καὶ μακαριότητος τὰ ῥήματα; καὶ οὐκ εἶπε, λάβετε, ἀλλὰ, κληρονομήσατε, ὡς οἰκεῖα, ὡς πατρῴα, ὡς ὑμέτερα, ὡς ὑμῖν ἄνωθεν ὀφειλόμενα. Πρὶν ἢ γὰρ ὑμᾶς γενέσθαι, φησὶ, ταῦτα ὑμῖν ἡτοίμαστο καὶ προευτρέπισμο ἐπειδὴ ᾔδειν τοιούτους ὑμᾶς ἐσομένους. Ib. Hom. lxxix. § 2.

Chapter V.

THE DOCTRINE OF FREEWILL IN RELATION TO DIVINE GRACE.

(a) *Generally.*

Man as the destined revealer of the Divine excellencies and the minister of his Maker's Will was created in the image and likeness of God. "Let us make man in our own image and after our likeness," are the remarkable words by which the creation of man is introduced in Holy Scripture. God is a Free Agent. His Will acts with supreme sovereignty and absolute dominion, when, where, and in what way He chooses. This power is reflected in man who chooses or refuses, accepts or rejects, what is presented to him with a wonderful resemblance to his Creator. If man were wanting in freewill and a being whose every action were necessary, then would there be such an essential difference as to render the language in Genesis simply misleading.

The language employed gives us the true idea of the highest work of the Creator's hand,—a being in His own image and likeness, a finite being which like its Creator, but under certain limitations, has an independent power of action—a power of self-determination. "Man, in perfection of nature," says Hooker,[1] "being made according to the likeness of his Maker resembleth Him also in the manner of working so that whatsoever we work as men, the same we do wittingly work, and freely." As Tertullian expresses the truth, "God made man at first after His own image with liberty of and power over his own will; and this appears from the law that He gave him, for neither would God have given a law to him who had not freedom to obey it, or have threatened death to the transgressor if he had not a freedom to contemn it, and so was it also in the laws given by God after the fall in which He sets before man good and evil, life and death; nor would the order of discipline be disposed by precepts in which God calls us from and exhorts us to things, and threatens our disobedience, did not man freely and voluntarily obey or condemn them."[2] The founding man's freewill on his being made in "the image of God" is a great truth.[3]

[1] Eccles. Pol. Bk. i. § 7. [2] Tert. lib. ii. *contra Marcion* c. 5, 6.

[3] Luther fell into error in not properly distinguishing between the nature itself of the mind and will which were the creation of God alone without man, and the virtue and uprightness which are perfected by his co-operation with the grace of God. The first is known as the "image," the second as the "likeness of God." This is an important distinction.

Free grace shines with all its own glorious lustre without receiving anything from freewill. The latter borrows all its light, power, and virtuous efficacy from free grace, just as the moon borrows all her light and glory from the sun. The moon is an object quite distinct from the sun, she has her own action independent of the sun, and yet in regard to the world she ever revolves in harmony and conjunction with the sun. And so with Divine grace and freewill. They should ever act in harmony—the latter operating in the glorious beams of the former, gathering all its strength, all its power and efficacy from the Divine ray.

Free grace is the first cause, and freewill the second, in our choice of moral good. The natural heart is enmity to God, and, till touched with the finger of the Almighty, chooses not what is acceptable in His Holy sight. On the other hand, in the choice of moral evil, freewill is the sole cause. To assert that Divine grace were a cause of our choosing evil would be running into the Manichean error of holding an evil as well as a good principle in the Godhead.

The controversy respecting freewill may be divided into two parts; first as to the existence of the will, and secondly as to the mode in which it is moved and determined.

That the will exists and is free in some sense of the word may be taken to be a general admission on both sides, but though there may be a verbal agreement, the word freedom is used in two very different senses by the upholders of the doctrines of necessity and freewill respectively. We must be careful, therefore, when we meet with the expression "freewill" in the Fathers to examine in what sense the word is used. For instance, Augustine uses the expression in a different sense to that in which it is ordinarily understood. He acknowledges a will in man which makes him act willingly as distinguished from acting by compulsion. His idea of freewill is like that of Locke and Edwards. Augustine's *ubi voluntati adjacet facultas faciendi*, corresponds with Locke's, "How can we think any one freer than to have the power to do what he will?"; and Edward's, "a man cannot be truly said to be unable to do a thing when he can do it if he will."

In fact Augustine's freewill does not mean more than a will—he does not sanction a self-determining will, nor anything more than the strictest necessitarian would be willing to admit.

Both Libertarians and Necessarians are agreed as to the Will being the immediate cause of action, but they differ as to the nature of its causality. The Necessarian looks upon the Will as a cause which is the effect of a prior cause, the Libertarians as a cause which is itself uncaused or self-originating. Both parties are agreed that men's emotions and intellects are subject to certain laws of cause and effect, but beyond this there is no agreement between them, the one asserts an exemption from these laws in

favour of the Will while the other maintains the subjection of the whole of man's faculties to the laws of cause and effect.

According to the Necessarians every human volition is the inevitable product of the character of the man and the circumstances in which he is placed, and the will is absolutely determined in all its acts by psychological laws. They consider that the cause of human actions must be sought in motives determined by laws of human nature, imposed on it by some power external to man—that is by laws of a conditioned causality alone: that there is an invariable and necessary connection between men's motives and their volitions, between objects of desire and pursuit as seen and apprehended by them and all their acts of volition; or that men's volitions are invariably determined by the last practical judgment of the understanding. Libertarians admit that men's volitions are ordinarily determined by motives as seen and apprehended by the mind, but deny that there is a law regulating our mental processes, by which this determination of volitions by motives is rendered invariable and necessary. On the contrary, they assert that human actions have an absolute beginning in the soul, and attribute them to some unconditioned cause in the soul as their first principle. And this latter assertion seems far more consonant to the consciousness of the individual unprejudiced by philosophical investigation. For most men will be found to admit, without hesitation, not only that they can choose what actions they will, but that their choice is determined to a great extent at least by something independent of the law of causation, in other words that the human soul contains an element independent of causality.

It is true that Necessarians admit liberty of a certain nature—a liberty in the sense of a power in man to do as he wills or pleases, but they contend that the whole human soul is subject to the law of causality, and consequently that his willing does not depend upon himself, but on the strength of motives, the state of his mind, and the circumstances in which he is placed, all of which are dependent on the laws of nature, human or physical. The liberty acknowledged is therefore merely an absence of external restraint, and is in reality no liberty at all, for it is not admitted that the man possesses any other power than of doing what he is unalterably determined or irresistibly impelled to do. It is a self-contradiction, an assertion that a man does what he wills when the will is absolutely determined by laws entirely beyond the control of the man himself.

The Necessarians have the support of almost the entire school of metaphysicians, and this is but natural, from the fact that they derive their conclusions through logical rules, and test the point by premises applicable only to the human understanding. Locke has an elaborate argument on the subject. He first examines the

question whether the will is free, and decides in the negative, on the ground that freedom is a power and the will a power, and that a power cannot be predicated of a power, power being the attribute of an agent.[1] He admits that if freedom can with any propriety of speech be applied to power, it may be attributed to the power that is in a man to produce or forbear producing, by choice or preference which is that which dominates him free and is freedom itself. He next examines the question whether the man is free to will, and decides that the man is not free in the case of any proposed action, generally and altogether in respect of willing, but that he must will one thing or another, either doing the act or abstaining from it. He is not free to will *neither way*, but must will one way. Coming then directly to the point he says:—"Since then, it is plain that in most cases a man is not at liberty whether he will or no, the next thing demanded is, whether a man be at liberty to will which of the two he pleases? This question carries the absurdity of it so manifestly in itself, that one might thereby be sufficiently convinced that liberty concerns not the will. For to ask whether a man be at liberty to will either motion or rest, speaking or silence, *which he pleases*, is to ask whether a man can will what he wills, or be pleased with what he is pleased with. A question which I think needs no answer; and they who can make a question of it, must suppose one will to determine the acts of another, and another to determine that, and so on *in infinitum*."[2]

The position that a man determines his own will is stated in such a form as to be apparently absurd, but it does not affect the truth. The language adopted by Locke to express the view he decides against is such as, in the assertion of the liberty of the man to will which of the two he pleases, to assume the previous existence of a particular decision of the will, as the condition of the power of the man to make it, but the truth might well be expressed in language not involving such an absurdity. For what is really meant is not the man's power to will as he wills or pleases, but simply his power to will.

Edwards's argument against the self-determinate power of the will, which is much the same as Locke's, is supposed by many to be unanswerable. It will be found in Part ii. § 1. of his work on "The Freedom of the Will." "If the will," says he, "determines

[1] He is right here, we should in strictness not attribute freedom to the *Will*, but to the soul or self.

[2] In a letter to his Irish friend Molineux (Jan. 20, 1692-3) Locke expresses himself in a very different spirit: "I own freely to you," he says, "the weakness of my understanding, that though it be unquestionable that there is omnipotence and omniscience in God our Maker, and I cannot have a clearer perception of anything than that I am free; yet I cannot make freedom in man consistent with omnipotence and omniscience in God, though I am as fully persuaded of both as of any truths I most firmly assent to. And therefore I have long since given off the consideration of that question, resolving all into this short conclusion, that if it be *possible* for God to make a free agent, then man is free, though I see not the way of it."

all its own free acts, the soul determines all the free acts of the will in the exercise of a power of willing and choosing, or which is the same thing, it determines them of choice; it determines its own acts by choosing its own acts. If the will determines the will, then choice orders and determines the choice; and acts of choice are subject to the decision and follow the conduct of other acts of choice. And, therefore, if the will determines all its own free acts, then every free act of choice is determined by a preceding act of choice, choosing that act. And if that preceding act of the will or choice be also a free act, then, by these principles, in this act too the will is self-determined; that is, this in like manner, is an act that the soul voluntarily chooses; or which is the same thing, it is an act determined by a preceding act of the will, choosing that. And the like may again be observed of the last mentioned act, which brings us directly to a contradiction; for it supposes an act of the will preceding the first act in the whole train, directing and determining the rest; or a free act of the will, before the first free act of the will. Or else we must come at last to an act of the will determining the consequent act, wherein the will is not self-determined, and so is not a free act, in this notion of freedom; but if the first act in the train, determining and fixing the rest, be not free, none of them all can be free."

The whole reasoning is founded upon the assumption that if the will determines itself it must determine itself by an act of choice. If the will determines itself it must do so by a previous act, and thus volition is made to determine a volition—a choice to choose a choice. If this be granted (which it is not), then the conclusion is inevitable—we have the absurdity of an infinite series of retrogressive choices or volitions.

Edwards begs the whole question. He assumes that the acts of choice which determine are not the same, but different from those which are determined. The motion of one thing being effected by the motion of another is common. It is mysterious certainly, but still the very fact of its universality is sufficient to make us think little of this. Self-motion, on the other hand, is not only more mysterious, but rarer. So too our language and habits of thought on the subject of motion are derived from the motion of inert bodies impelled by extraneous force. Edwards takes advantage of these two facts, and assumes that in every case of motion, the things moved must be distinct from the thing moved. His fallacy had been ages before exposed by Cicero in stating the doctrine of the Stoic Carneades. "For when," says he, "they had granted that there is no motion without a cause, they did not grant that everything that happens happens from antecedent causes; for there are no external and antecedent causes of our will . . . . An external cause is not to be sought to account

for the voluntary motions of souls. For every voluntary motion is in itself of this nature that it is in our own power and obeys us; nor is that without a cause; for the cause of the thing is the nature of the thing itself."[1]

One of the great arguments of the Necessarians against the self-determining power of the will or of the man in willing has been founded on the assumption that human actions must have a cause, and that such a cause cannot be a flexible thing as the power of choice is shown to be—for an act of the will or of the man in willing cannot directly and immediately arise out of a state of indifference.

To this it may be answered that for a determination of the man in willing it is not necessary to assign a cause, such determination being an original motion of the will or of the man in willing. And amidst motive influences of a thousand kinds the issue is in the man's voluntary choice, and of this he is distinctly conscious.

The attributing a self-determining power to the will is certainly open to objection, though the expression is very common amongst those who have contended for the freedom of the will against the Necessarians. In fact, many ground their arguments entirely on the existence of such a power in the will. For, strictly speaking, a power cannot thus be attributed to the will which is itself only a power and not an entity or agent. It is absurd, therefore, to say the will determines itself. The will itself has no real objective existence, except in its embodiment in an act, and only in the moment of the act. It is the self-determining power of the being endowed with will to which should be attributed freedom.

The will is not a separate, distinct, or objective entity in our spiritual nature. The term expresses only the logical distinction of one of the faculties of the Ego or self—only a peculiar mode of the self-manifestation of the man. In ordinary language, indeed, we often speak of the will as that part of the soul which determines or controls, that part of the man which produces volitions or wills, but this language is not strictly accurate.

It is the man, self-conscious, not any part of him who wills, just as it is not the mind as a part of the man, but the Ego itself one and indivisible that thinks. The volition may be said to be the determining, but that which determines is the Ego or self,—the spiritual noumenon, as the controlling centre of all its powers.

It is true that many thinkers, such for instance as Cousin and Mansel, identify the faculty of will with the Ego or self, or at least consider the connection between individuality and volition to be

[1] Cum enim concessissent motum nullum esse sine causâ, non concedere, omnia quæ fierent, fieri causis antecedentibus: voluntatis enim nostræ non esse causas externas et antecedentes . . . . Ad animorum motus voluntarios non est requirenda externa causa. Motus enim voluntarius eam naturam in se ipse continet, ut sit in nostra potestate, nobisque pareat; nec id sine causa: ejus enim rei causa, ipsa natura est. *De Fato*, § 11.

so close as to amount to identity. Morrell thus sets forth Cousin's view, "We all feel conscious that there is something we call ourselves, which possesses and can exert power, and to which, as a fundamental unity, all the multiplicity of our thoughts and feelings are to be referred. This power, or energy, however—which we variously call the *will*, the acting and knowing principle, or *the me*—is not an infinite and absolute power."[1] Yet we apprehend that this position cannot be successfully maintained, for the will is itself as much a faculty or power as thought or feeling; it is, in short, *the* faculty by which the Ego manifests itself. This is very clearly set forth by a late eminent writer.[2] "To identify the will," says he, "with the 'acting and knowing principle,' is to say that the 'acting power,' or 'power of action,' is the same as the 'acting principle'; whereas of course, the 'principle' is that to which the power belongs. The truth is that the 'me' or 'ego' *possesses* the power of '*willing*,' just as truly as it possesses the power of thought. To be consistent, therefore, it must be maintained, either, (1) that the intellect, and the emotions and desires are truly the Ego as well as the *Will*, a position which no philosopher has ever maintained; or (2) as is clearly the only defensible position, that *the will*, quite as truly as the other three, is a faculty by which the Ego manifests itself. Its speciality, it is true, gives it a sort of *sovereignty*. While the others are mere faculties, mere servants, which do the work, it is a faculty over these faculties, that by which power is realized *over* these other powers; and so in sort the 'suzerain' or 'satrap,' in the 'empire' of the nature. But the sovereignty is subordinate and representative, not ultimate. The satrap is still a servant, the suzerain still acts only in accordance with the express dictates of the supreme master. That supreme master, absolute emperor, is the *Ego*, which does not divide its power with, but exercises it through, the Will. Though the sole *executive* is volition, the monopoly of administration rests with the Ego. Though the channel and instrument of all action is the Will, the fountain of all authority, the source of all power, is the Ego itself."

The mind has four cardinal faculties, (1) will, (2) imagination, (3) understanding or reason, (4) sensitivity. All doing or causation belongs to the first, all truth conceivable to the second, all truth and facts actual to the third, all sensations, emotions, desires and passions to the fourth. The Ego is to these four faculties as the head is to the four limbs of the body, as a sovereign to his four princes. In willing, the Ego manifests itself as doer or author in the strictest sense of the term. It is a doer having life and power in itself, not necessarily determined in any of its acts. It is the very personality itself. To this Ego—this personality we attribute

[1] "History of Modern Philosophy," Intro. [2] Turner's "Wish and Will."

freedom. It may obey reason in opposition to passion, or passion in opposition to reason, or obey both in their harmonious union. It is the centre of our being, all the other parts of our being, being related to it as the governing part. As Mr. Turner[1] well sums up the position. "The ontological significance of the phenomena of volition then . . . . is the establishment of the position that the word 'I' is the name of a *real* spiritual entity; that the controlling agent in volition is a *spiritual* personality which has an existence distinct and distinguishable from the mental phenomena and processes it controls, and from the physical organism which it employs for the attainment and effectuation of objects, freely chosen from alternative courses, and decided upon in the exercise of this regal power of choice."

Those who hold the doctrine of freewill are satisfied, negatively, that the self-determining power of the man in willing does not contradict their reason, and, affirmatively, rest on their own consciousness of its existence. It is true, that perhaps logically this consciousness does not amount to more than the existence of the power of determination—all the individual is distinctly conscious of being his power to will. Still, as individuals, we seem instinctively to bear the stamp of originality, of self-determination, and the opposite idea that we are necessitated or our wills determined, suggests an idea of unreality and a notion contrary to our actual consciousness and experience. Is there not something within which testifies to our originality as agents, and repudiates the suggestion that our wills are moved from without? Is it not on account of our self-determining power that our conscience is tortured, and moral evil brought home instantly to us? How can there be vice in an act of the will that has a *cause* in the necessitating sense of the term? Is it not on account of the self-determinating power that man stands accused as a responsible creature and becomes justly amenable to punishment?

An argument derived from motive is sometimes relied on to prove that we act necessarily. Sometimes the assertion takes the form of 'every act of the will is excited by the motive,' and at other times, 'the will is always determined by the stronger motive.'

Under the first proposition the motive is assigned as the cause, and the act of the will as the effect, and from this it is argued that volitions being necessarily connected with their motives in the relation of effect to cause, they are necessary and cannot arise from any self-determining power. But the argument is most inconclusive, and quite ignores the distinction between a necessary cause and a sufficient cause. It is quite possible the man in willing does not act in the absence of all motive. Indeed his freedom is not usually shown in action without motive, but generally

[1] "Wish and Will."

in choosing between motives; and acts of volition do consequently to some extent depend on the existence of motives; but it does not follow that the motive alone is sufficient to cause the act, and if it be not sufficient to do this, a self-determining power is unaffected.

The advocates of Necessity now give expression to their theory by a different word and call it *determinism.* The change is made to get rid of the idea of compulsion. The absolute certainty of the action remains, the idea of force only is removed.

The upholders of Necessity find in man nothing higher than his intellect, they judge every action of his being, even those of the moral will, by a test applicable only to the logical understanding —a test utterly inapplicable to that spiritual existence and action of man to which his moral will belongs.

This fallacy of applying an intellectual test to an act of the moral will is apparent throughout the Necessarian scheme. It is difficult, if not impossible, truly to express the higher forms of spiritual truth in words applicable to action or mode of operation in natural things. Language itself is constituted on an intellectual or logical, not a spiritual basis, and if the mystery of the action of freewill could be set forth and made plain in terms capable of being comprehended by the understanding, it could no longer be properly termed a mystery. The will is not a mere faculty of the intellect—it is also a spiritual faculty. It is the very endowment by which God has made His creatures most to resemble Himself. Its exercise supposes choice, and choice supposes deliberation on the part of the man, and so far as these are concerned they are mental operations, but it passes beyond the region of the mind into that of the spirit, and there is in its exercise an originating action, a spiritual action, not separable from, but arising within and belonging to, the very personality of which we may become conscious without having it in our power to explain its mode of operation in terms suitable for comprehension by the intellect. For the Spirit proceeds by its own internal action—action inscrutable in regard to its origin and mode of operation.

"If there be aught spiritual in man," says Coleridge, "the will must be such. If there be a will, there must be a spirituality in man." Just so, but the will is not the whole spiritual faculty—it is but a part. There is, besides the power of willing, the power or faculty of recognising spiritual truth.

The existence of the will as a spiritual faculty cannot be proved any more than the operation of the senses can be proved. It can only be felt, experienced, and known by our consciousness. The feeling which we have at the moment of decision that we are free to do the thing or not to do it, and the possibility and still more the existence of such a thing as self-discipline, seem evidences that each man has "a self-forming or self-framing power by which

every man is self-made into what he is, and accordingly deserves either praise or dispraise, reward or punishment."[1]

Mr. Bain in his "Emotions and Will" admits spontaneity, but admits it only as the result of the physical mechanism under the stimulus of nutrition. He shows that the spontaneous tendency operates all through life and has a definite influence upon the acts. But self-determination in the sense of any new and distinct species of voluntary action, or as implying something different from the operation of the motive forces of pleasurable and painful sensibility, coupled with the central spontaneity of the system, he entirely denies. In the setting up of a determining power under the name of "self" as in contrast to the whole region of motives generated as described by him, he sees only an erroneous conception of the facts. "The proper meaning of self," says he, "can be nothing more than my corporeal existence, coupled with my sensations, thoughts, emotions and volitions, supposing the classification exhaustive and the sum of these in the past, present, and future. Everything of the nature of a moving power belonging to this totality is a part of self. The action of the lungs, the movements of the heart, are self-determined; and when I go to the fire to get warm, lie down under fatigue, ascend a height for the sake of a prospect, the actions are as much self-determined as it is possible for actions to be. I am not able to concede the existence of an inscrutable entity in the depths of one's being to which the name *I* is to be distinctively applied, and not consisting of any bodily organ or function, or any one mental phenomenon that can be specified." And in another place he says, "If self-determination is held to imply something different from the operation of the motive forces of pleasurable and painful sensibility, coupled with the central spontaneity of the system, there is an imputation on the sufficiency of the common analysis of the mind. Emotion, volition, and intellect as explained with full detail in the present work, must still leave a region unexplored. A fourth or residual department would need to be constituted, the department of 'self' or me-action, and we should set about the investigation of the laws (or the anarchy), prevailing there as in the three remaining branches."

Without casting any imputation on the sufficiency of Mr. Bain's able analysis of the *mind*, we venture to suggest that he has totally ignored the spiritual part of man and its powerful action upon his mental faculties. He seems to assume that if there be in reality a self-determining power, it must necessarily be discovered in the mind: but this does not follow: although at the same time an analysis of the mind which concerns itself with mere states or modes of activity, and omits all inquiry into the moral self-

[1] Cudworth, § 10.

determining power of the man as a spiritual being, cannot but be regarded as somewhat defective.

Mr. Mill takes no higher ground than Mr. Bain. His Law of Causation, if strictly interpreted, leaves no power in the man to help his actions, be they good, bad, or indifferent. His theory of causation is that were *all* the causes known to us, and were our intelligence competent to deal with the complex process of them, we could confidently predict the will of a man's action; and yet it is true he holds to a belief in issues alterable by human efforts and desires. He rests his theory on the applicability of a doctrine of cause and effect to the department of the human will, because one class of events takes place according to a certain law, therefore another does. At the best it is but conjectural. Because he finds certain rules in the physical world he assumes they exist in the moral—what is found true of matter is assumed to be true of all being whatsoever. But when we consider the essential difference between mind and matter, the entirely different impressions we have with respect to our actions and events in nature, surely a strong presumption arises of the danger of accepting the law regulating the one as regulative of the other. We may readily admit that the material world is wholly a succession of antecedents and consequents, or of causes and effects, that there is no such thing as departure from the great laws of the universe; but when we pass from the material to the moral, we find no such invariable law of cause and effect. We discover a kind of power to which there is no analogy in the material world. In the moral, man does not take his place in a succession of antecedents and consequents, he is constituted a voluntary being, with a faculty of choosing. In fact, philosophy, as too generally received, builds a theory of the universe on material principles alone, and neglects that which experience forces upon us every moment of our lives—the perpetual interchange of the relations of matter and mind.[1]

The tendency of modern materialistic speculation is to reduce

[1] "In passing," says Dean Mansel, "from the material to the moral world, we pass at once from the phenomenal to the real; from the successive to the continuous; from the many to the one; from an endless chain of mutual dependence to an originating self-determining source of power. That mysterious, yet unquestionable presence of *will*—that agent, uncompelled, yet not uninfluenced, whose continuous existence and productive energy are summed up in the word *myself*;—that perpetual struggle of good with evil;—that warning and prompting of a spirit, striving with our spirit, commanding, yet not compelling, acting upon us, yet leaving us free to act for ourselves;—that two-fold consciousness of infirmity and strength in the hour of temptation;—that grand ideal of what we ought to be, so little, alas! to be gathered from the observation of what we are;—that overwhelming conviction of sin in the sight of One higher and holier than we;—that irresistible impulse to prayer, which bids us pour out our sorrows and make our wants known to One who hears and will answer us;—that indefinable, yet inextinguishable consciousness of a direct intercourse and communion of man with God, of God's influence upon man, yea (with reverence be it spoken) of man's influence with God; these are facts of experience, to the full as real and as certain as the laws of planetary motions and chemical affinities; facts which philosophy is bound to take into account, or to stand convicted as shallow and one-sided; facts which can deceive us only if our consciousness is a liar, and the boasted voice of Reason itself but an echo of the universal lie." Limits of Religious Thought. Lect. vi.

mind to a mode, mental activity to a function, of matter. The principle of the convertibility of force is usually regarded by metaphysicians as applicable to the phenomena of consciousness and thought in common with those of material nature.[1]

"Correctly conceived," says Mr. Mill, "the doctrine called Philosophical Necessity is simply this: That given the motives which are present to an individual mind, and likewise the character and disposition of the individual, the *manner* in which he will act may be unerringly inferred; that if we knew the person thoroughly, and knew all the inducements which are acting upon him, we could foretell his conduct with as much certainty as we can predict any physical event. This proposition I take to be a mere interpretation of universal experience, a statement in words of what everyone is internally convinced of. No one who believed that he knew thoroughly the circumstances of any case, and the characters of the different persons concerned, would hesitate to foretell how all of them would act. Whatever degree of doubt he may feel arises from the uncertainty whether he really knows the circumstances or the character of some one or other of the persons with the degree of accuracy required; but by no means from thinking, that if he did know these things, there would be any uncertainty what the conduct would be. Nor does this full assurance conflict in the smallest degree with what is called our feeling of freedom."

[1] The principle is ably met by Principal Caird in his "Philosophy of Religion." "That notion of Force or Physical Causality," says he, "from which the materialist would construct the world independently of mind, is itself a creation or category of mind, and instead of looking for thought or mental energy as the final product into which force is convertible, we must regard force as itself something which exists only for thought. It is true that what the empiricist understands by causality is nothing more than the regular co-existences and successions of phenomena which sensible experience gives, and that he regards any bond of necessity between them as a mere subjective fiction or metaphysical illusion. But that causality is not an illusive notion superimposed on experience, is proved by the fact that no experience, and especially no scientific or systematic experience, would be possible without it. The notion or belief in the uniformity of nature, on which all science rests, is not built up by experience, but is presumed in every single act of scientific observation. For in the endeavour to account for any change, we imply that it is a change in an order which is, by supposition, constant, and it is only on that presupposition that there is any need to account for it. Alteration that is not referred to what does *not* alter is the alteration of nothing. That there are sequences which are not arbitrary but invariable—linked together by a bond of absolute necessity—is a foregone presumption in every investigation or experiment by which we seek to discover and register the conditions under which phenomenal change takes place. In other words, science, in order to its very existence, rests on an idea, not indeed brought to or superimposed on nature, but perceived in nature, yet which mere sensible experience could never give us—the idea, namely, of necessary causation. And so we recur again to the principle that you cannot evolve thought out of the forces or material energies of nature, seeing that in order to any knowledge of these, nay to the very existence of these—if the word existence is to have any meaning for us—thought is already presupposed. All materialistic explanations involve the vicious circle, that matter which is the object of thought is that which produces thought. To make thought a function of matter is thus, simply, to make thought a function of itself." P. 100, 101. Principal Caird then goes on to show that another vice in materialistic theories is that of attempting to make mechanical causation the master-principle by which all the phenomena of the world, from those of inorganic nature up to conscious intelligence, are explained; and he shows there is a gap, a solution of continuity, which it is impossible by the help of the supposed master-principle of force to bridge over.

But do we, as a matter of fact, observe any such law of causation in our moral actions? Does our consciousness give us the full assurance Mr. Mill imagines? Our answer is: It does not. It may be that this is because we never have the requisite accuracy as to *data*; but if not, then experience furnishes us no help. The appeal, therefore, to universal experience is a delusion, for how can *that* give sanction to the definition in question when no one has ever so known the character and disposition of any one other person, as to enable him absolutely to determine the manner in which he would act under given circumstances. If experience speaks at all, it is against the hypothesis on which the doctrine rests. The consciousness which the holders of causation or necessity are assumed to have is an assumption of the point at issue.

Mr. Mill is aware of natural conviction of originality in the human mind, and he makes certain admissions in deference to this, going so far as to acknowledge that a man may to some extent *form his own character*. And on this he mainly bases the distinction which he draws between his theory of Causation and the views of the Fatalist. This is his admission and attempt at distinction:—"A fatalist believes, or half-believes (for nobody is a consistent fatalist), not only that whatever is about to happen will be an infallible result of the causes which produce it (which is the true Necessarian doctrine), but, moreover, that there is no use struggling against it; that it will happen however we may strive to prevent it. Now, a Necessarian believing that our actions follow from our characters, and that our characters follow from our organisation, our education, and our circumstances, is apt to be, with more or less of consciousness on his part, a fatalist as to his actions, and to believe that his nature is such, or that his education and circumstances have so moulded his character, that nothing can now prevent him from feeling and acting in a particular way, or at least that no effort of his own can hinder it. In the words of the sect (Owenite), which in our own day has been most perniciously inculcated and most perversely misunderstood this great doctrine, his character is formed *for* him, and not *by* him; therefore his wishing that it had been formed differently is of no use, he has no power to alter it. But this is a grand error. He has to a certain extent a power to alter his character. It being in the ultimate resort formed for him is not inconsistent with its being in part formed by him as one of the intermediate agents. His character is formed by his circumstances (including among these his particular organization); but his own desire to mould it in a particular way is one of those circumstances, and by no means one of the least influential. We cannot, indeed, directly will to be different from what we are; but neither did those who are supposed to have formed our characters directly will that we should be what we are." And again, "The true doctrine of the

causation of human actions maintains . . . . that not only our conduct, but our character is in part amenable to our will; that we can, by employing the proper means, improve our character; and that if our character is such, that while it remains what it is, it necessitates us to do wrong, it will be just to apply motives which will necessitate us to strive for its improvement, and so emancipate ourselves from the other necessity. In other words, we are under a moral obligation to seek the improvement of our moral character."

But, as Mr. Mill holds that we have no power over the will itself, by which only the character can be modified, it is difficult to see how we can have the power to modify our character. And after all, this feeling of being able to modify our character if we wish, which seems to press so strongly at times on Mr. Mill as to somewhat mar his logical position, what is it but the feeling of moral freedom which we are all conscious of more or less?[1]

Mr. Mill's attempt to harmonise with his scheme of unconditional Causation or Necessity the *moral* nature of man, in virtue of which he is held culpable in his evil actions, is certainly a failure. The fact is, the logical understanding is incompetent to treat the subject effectively; it can only be dealt with in a region of thought where mere logic is useless. It passes the province of the mere

[1] It does not follow that we need hold Freedom of the Will in such a way as to exclude Causation altogether, for it may well find its true place, though we may not be able to explain how, as co-existing with it in human action. There is no absolute necessity of choosing between the two. Dr. Carpenter, in an article "On the Doctrine of Human Automatism" in the *Contemporary Review*, Feb., 1875, certainly holds to free will without denying the law of causation as universal, and even as inclusive of human volition. He says: "After an attentive re-examination of the whole question, I find nothing in the results of more recent researches to shake my early-formed conviction of the existence of a fundamental distinction, not only between the rational actions of sentient beings guided by experience and the automatic movements of creatures whose whole life is obviously but the working of a mechanism, but also between those actions (common to man and intelligent brutes) which are determined by a preponderating attraction towards an object present to the consciousness and those (peculiar as I believe to man) in which there is, at one stage or another, *a distinct intervention of the self-conscious Ego, whereby the direction of the activity is modified.*" Dr. Travis, in his "Moral Freedom reconciled with Causation," professes to harmonise self-determination with causation. He denies that the will is a distinct entity, or a peculiar power of an entity distinct from the organised being. He defines the power of self-determination to be a power to augment the strength of our right motives, so as to cause them to preponderate over our wrong desires—a power in the true sense of the term, by the exercise of which we can determine the formation of our volitions, so that they may be formed not for us and not by us, but *by* us as well as for us. His theory is that man is able, if educated aright, to give a decided preponderance to a particular motive in opposition to another, and by a process of mental activity to increase the desire for volition in some particular direction. He does not seem to give sufficient weight to the operation of grace. He considers that the true view of man's power in relation to his opinions and feelings is that they are mental *affections*, and as results in the production of which the individual is not entirely passive, and over which in some cases he has some power. He asserts that the "nisus" or effort which has been supposed to be in the volition, is really in the bodily or organic effort, by means of which the thought is detained during the process of self-determination, and which bodily efforts are intimately intermixed with the successive volitions which occur in that process. He asserts distinctly that all our mental affections are dependent upon our organisms and upon peculiar modifications of particular parts of that organism, a proposition we are decidedly unable to agree with. This is the root of his system; and its great defect is its making mental facts entirely and exclusively dependent upon the organism.

logician into the region of mystery. Here we find ourselves in a position to assert the integrity of consciousness, vindicate freedom as given with it, along with moral responsibility.

Of all the metaphysicians, Sir William Hamilton seems to have approached nearest the truth. He says: "Specially in its doctrine of Causality this philosophy brings us back from the aberrations of modern theology to the truth and simplicity of the ancient Church. It is here shown to be as irrational as irreligious on the ground of human understanding to deny either, on the one hand, the foreknowledge, predestination, and free grace of God, as on the other the freewill of man, that we should believe both, and both in unison, though unable to comprehend either even apart." And this conciliation, he adds, is "of the things to be believed, not understood."

Truly men have not been able to analyze the Spirit as they have been able to analyze the Mind. If we are asked to distinguish between the spirit and mind, to point out their distinctive provinces, we dare not make the attempt. We could no more do this than we could, from the outside of the Tabernacle in the Wilderness covered with its curtains, point out the spot where the Holy Place was linked and united with the Most Holy Place. We can only see through a glass darkly, and but sufficiently to attribute to the spirit those operations of which we are conscious, though we fail to trace the manner of their action, or to arrive at any proper conception of the process by which they are effected, which we are usually able by attentive reflection to do, to a greater or less degree, in the action of our intellect.

We see the mystery of the respective positions of spirit and mind in the Tabernacle of old—ever regarded by theologians as the type or figure of that Tabernacle in which we now dwell, or with which we are clothed in this present condition. In the three divisions we recognise—the three great parts of man—his body, soul or mind, and spirit. St. Paul refers to this three-fold constitution when he says, "I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ."[1]

The outer Court was uncovered or exposed to view. It has reference to the animal or sensitive part of man—his body. Many were allowed to enter here. So our anatomists have been able to distinguish with precision, the various parts of the human frame—the operations of the several organs and so forth. The Tabernacle proper, was entirely concealed from all without. It represents the intellectual and spiritual parts of man both withdrawn from the observation of the senses, but distinct the one from the other. The first part of it, however, the Holy Place, was lighted by the

[1] 1 Thess. v. 23.

light of the Golden Candlestick and was accessible to the Priests. So our metaphysicians, by the light of reason, have been able to analyze the mind and have in truth laid bare the actions and functions of its various parts. Patient inquiry has effected much here, and the intellectual faculties have proved a fruitful field for investigators. But there has been ever a something beyond their comprehension, namely, the mystery of the individual, the Ego, the spirit, or call it what they may, to which some have been candid enough to attribute freewill and spiritual capacities for receiving impressions and experiencing emotions. Any attempt to bring this something within the domain of logical reasoning has failed. It was of this spirit, that the second part of the Tabernacle, the Most Holy Place, told. It was lighted only by the glory of the presence of the Lord from between the Cherubim, and into this place none but the High Priest entered, and he but once a year.

Our Great High Priest has entered into this place, entered by His own blood, and is still there. He holds the mystery of what is within the veil, and for its solution we must wait in patience, until the day when He shall come forth again to bless His waiting people—the day when we shall no longer see through a glass darkly but face to face—when we shall know even as we are known. Until that day men may seek in vain to bring the faculties of the spirit within the domain of the human understanding. What is within the veil—in the spirit—can only be discerned by the light of the Spirit of God.

Sadly too little have men thought of their Spirit, so accustomed have they grown to regard themselves as of but two parts—soul and body. But high and lofty as is the soul of man, it is *not* the link which touches the heavenly chain, it is *not* the most holy place wherein is revealed the glory of God. *This* is the spirit. Here is life. Here is light. We cannot, properly speaking, prove the existence of our spirit, any more than we can the operations of our senses, it can only be felt and asserted; but the evidence of our spiritual consciousness and mode of action is not less demonstrable than that of our senses.

We have no desire to extend our observations to the power of action generally, or to deal with the power of volition in the abstract, we desire rather to restrict our inquiry to the nature and character of the *moral* freedom of the will. It is this alone which can touch the responsibility of man to his God, and which can, therefore, directly come within the limits within which we are necessarily restricted in a work of the present description. An action which has a moral element is quite different from one which has no such element, and it is the more remarkable, that so singularly clear headed a man as President Edwards should have been so far wedded to his pet scheme of necessity, as to have lost sight, at least to a great extent, of the important distinction between an

action in its moral aspect, and an action as the exercise of mere voluntary power for any or for no end.

It is clear, from the very nature of man's being, that there is a moral element in every action of his. Morals are often treated as if good and evil were moral conditions which may exist in man in himself without reference to his God. But thus treated, the true mark is missed, and the centre, from which truly springs all moral obligation, is clouded or lost sight of. The duty of obedience to God is the key-note of morality. The Almighty Himself, taught this lesson in the Garden of Eden, as being the first and greatest truth to be learned by His creature. "For how little, came sin and death into the world," sneers the sceptic. He sees not, or cares not to see, that in that incident recorded in the third chapter of the book Genesis, is revealed as in a focus the sum and end of the great lesson, then begun, which God has been teaching His people through every age, and which they have as yet but too indifferently mastered.

Conscious dependence on and obedience to God is the root of moral good, as attempted independence of and disobedience to Him is the root of moral evil or sin. There is no doubt, in most cases, an act of the will anterior to the outward action, and this is the act of choice as to whether we will do God's will or our own. It is a contention which has to be fought out in the conscience, and is purely a spiritual act. There are thousands and myriads of cases in which this anterior act of the will declares itself, and the resolutions whereof never find expression in action, the act of the will never passing the region of thought. The cause in which the determination of the will may be made, the contingencies upon the happening of which it is involved may possibly never arise; but such acts of the will are not less real. Neither are they less free because they may be in dependence upon and subject to the revealed or known will of God.

The great temptation of man is to separate himself from his spiritual unity with—his entire and faithful dependence on—God. His temptation is to break the unity, and place himself in the wicked position of separation from God and in independence of his Creator.

The power of moral self-determination is one of God's most precious gifts to man. By this he is enabled, either righteously to rest in obedience to and unity with God, or wickedly to depart from Him, and adopt his own individual will in independence of His.

An act as such, simply has no morality in it, and the power of effecting any action, good or evil, is undoubtedly from God as the sole first cause of all power. The morality of an act, its rectitude or obliquity, consists in its relative aspect to God's will or law, and it is the act as exercised in opposition to such will or law rather

than in conformity to it, or the omission of the act, which is the ground of its sinfulness; and so *è contra.* God, therefore, though the first cause of our liberty and power of action (He having made us free agents), and the first cause of the moral goodness of any of our actions, inasmuch as by His grace He makes them good, yet is in no way the first cause of our actions as evil. "For," says Augustine, "as the bodily eye is not assisted by the light that it may turn away therefrom shut and averted, but get the assistance of the light in order that it may see,—being wholly incapable of vision without such help,—so God, who is the light of the inner man, aids our mental sight, in order that we do some good, not after our own, but according to His righteousness. Whenever we turn away from Him, it is our own act; we then show carnal wisdom, we then give our consent to the unholy promptings of fleshly concupiscence. When we turn to Him, God helps us; when we turn away from Him, He forsakes us."[1]

Adam had proper power, natural and moral, to have stood when he fell—he sinned not for want of necessary power to have stood, nor from want of sufficient grace to have obeyed the law of God, for God neither denied nor withheld from him any necessary assistance or support, but because he relied on himself where he should have looked to his God, and exercised his freewill in opposition to the will of the Almighty. To deny this would be to resolve all sin into God's irresistible, necessitating operation, a resolution at once opposed to sound theology, and subversive of all good morals.

Augustine thought that man, even in his unfallen condition, required supernatural aid from above; that from the very beginning he needed communion with God in order to develop into a higher condition—a condition to which his nature was adapted and destined. And he used the word *gratia* as expressive of this pre-requisite for development.

It must be admitted that all rational creatures are as much dependent on the Creator as other creatures of His hand, and that without his continuous co-operation even their original powers cannot continue to operate and develop. But much of the difference of opinion which has existed as to the nature of this assistance, has arisen from not properly distinguishing between the universal Divine influence on which all creaturely action depends, and without which even the powers implanted in man cannot continue in operation, and grace in a more restricted sense as expressive of that power superadded to the original powers, or influencing them and exalting men into communication with their God. This distinction was for the first time clearly and definitely marked by Hugo à St. Victore, who, in answering the question as to what, in man's original state, grace in the wider sense was

[1] De Peccatorum Meritis et Remissions, lib. ii. cap. v.

requisite, and what in the more restricted sense, says: "The former sufficed to keep man from falling, with his freewill, from the position where he was placed by the original constitution of his nature; but to actual righteousness, the actual accomplishment of good works and progress therein, he could not attain without some new supervening grace. Before sin, man was able by his freewill, with the assistance of that common grace (that is, the universal Divine influence—*concursus*) to avoid evil; but he needed *gratia co-operans* in order to perform anything positively good. But after the fall he needed not only *gratia co-operans*, but also *gratia operans*." Hugo à St. Victore marked a distinction ignored by those champions of Calvinism, Edwards and Chalmers, for they, by placing the doctrine of philosophical necessity so prominently in the foreground, have lost sight of this distinction, and cast a veil over the scriptural doctrine of original sin and its effect on fallen man and his will. In Edwards this is specially marked, for he makes no distinction between the liberty of the will in man, unfallen and fallen. He was too full of the importance of proving the compatibility of the philosophical doctrine of necessity with responsibility and moral agency, to give due effect to the inability of man, in his fallen and natural condition, to will anything *spiritually* good *on the ground of depravity*.

It is clear that man's freewill was affected by the fall of our first parents, and this is generally admitted by Christian writers, though they differ much as to the extent to which it was affected.

There are those, as the Adamites, who assert that Adam transmitted no moral corruption to his offspring in consequence of his fall, and they hold that the nature of man at the present time is not more depraved than the nature of Adam at his first creation. This is practically a denial of original sin, and is the view taken by the Socinians. Then there are those who rush to the opposite extreme, and hold that the sin of Adam made such a change in his nature as to destroy his freewill, and introduced such a radical depravity as to render it impossible for him to make any voluntary effort towards virtue, that there was no relic of what man once was any more than in lost spirits, and that faith and all Christian graces could thenceforth be communicated only by the *irresistible* operation of the Spirit of God, without any effort or concurrence on man's part. This is the position taken by the Calvinists. These generally lay great stress on the imputation of Adam's sin to all his posterity, though admitting that such imputation is accompanied with actual depravity in the heart of each. Calvin, however, himself, seems rather to have held that all men were liable to condemnation because of their own sinfulness derived from Adam, than on account of the imputation of Adam's sin.[1]

[1] "Atque ideo infantes quoque ipsi, dum suam secum damnationem a matris utero afferunt, *non alieno, sed suo ipsorum vitio* sunt obstricti."—Calv., *Inst.*, lib. ii., cap. 1, § 8.

There are various modifications of these views. Pelagius thought that, notwithstanding the fall, man was so entirely free that there was no need of any other grace than that of pardon, and of proposing the truths of religion to his knowledge.[1] Pelagius, however, uses words which might well have been used by his great opponent Augustine, but he puts a very different construction upon them. He uses, for instance, the word *grace* as referring to something very different to the meaning which the Catholic Church assigns to such word. He says: "I no doubt asserted that a man was able by his own exertion and the grace of God to live without sin; but you know very well what I mean by *grace*, and you may recollect in your perusal of my book that *grace is that condition in which we are created by God with a freewill.*"[2] Similarly to this Cœlestius, one of the chief of his followers, asserts that "God's grace and assistance is not given for single actions, but is imparted in the *freedom of the will*, or in the *law* and in *doctrine*." They, in fact, thought that in order to avoid sin, and to fulfil righteousness, man has sufficient power, having been created with a free will, and that God's grace lies in the fact that we have been so created as to be able to accomplish so much by the exercise of our free will, and in the further fact that God has given to us the assistance of His law and commandments. Pelagius consequently taught that in all moral exhortations the main point to be impressed was that men were in want of none of those faculties necessary for fulfilling the Divine commands, and that the great object was to bring to men a conscious sense of the power bestowed on them by the Creator for accomplishing the ends of their creation. This is the method he himself says he employed in his exhortatory writing.[3]

The result of this, of course, is that when even God helps a man He must be supposed to help him to turn away from evil and to do good simply by giving him the revelation of His will and teaching him what he ought to do, but not with the additional assistance of His co-operation and inspiration, that he may accomplish that which he has had his eyes open to see he ought to do, a position entirely opposed to the teaching of the Church.

In Pelagius's system he places with three distinct functions

[1] Cœlestius, a monk of Ireland, who was a follower of Pelagius, had his views thus stated and condemned at the Council of Carthage: "That Adam was created mortal, and would have died whether he had sinned or not. That the sin of Adam hurt only himself, and not all mankind. That infants new born are in the same state as Adam was before he fell. That a man may be without sin, and keep God's commandments, if he will."

[2] By *grace* Augustine, his opponent, means, in such a sentence as that above, the grace by which we have been adopted and been made new creatures, not that by which we were created—two very different things.

[3] So in his letter to Demetrias, c. 1, he says: "Quem ego exhortationis ordinem, cum in aliis quoque opusculis tenuerim, tum hic maxime observandum puto, ubi eo plenius naturæ bonum declarari debet, quo instituenda est vita perfectior, ne tanto remissior sit ad virtutem animus ac tardior, quanto minus se posse credat, et dum quod sibi inesse ignorat, id se existimat non habere."

three faculties by which he says God's commandments are fulfilled—*posse*, possibility; *velle*, volition; and *esse*, being or action. The *possibility* he places in our nature, the volition in our will, and the being or act in our conduct. The first of these faculties, expressed in the term *posse*, is not in the power of the creature, but is especially assigned to God, who has bestowed it on us even against our own will. The other two, indicated in the terms *velle* and *esse*, the volition and the action, he refers to the human agent, because they flow forth from the fountain of his will. That a man possesses the possibility of willing and effecting any good work is therefore assigned to God—the possibility of accomplishing any good thing, by thought, word, or deed, comes from Him who has endowed us with this possibility; but that we ever think a good thought, speak a good word, or do a good act, proceeds from ourselves, because we are also able to turn these to evil. And Pelagius gives the following example: That we have the possibility of seeing with our eyes is no power of ours; but it is in our own power whether we make a good or a bad use of our eyes. According to his view, God's grace has nothing to do with assisting those two faculties which he assigns to ourselves, but that only which is not in our power, namely the possibility. And to the faculties which are assigned to ourselves are attributed such efficacy that they require no Divine help, whereas the faculty we have from God is regarded as so weak as to require constantly the aid of Divine grace. "As if," says Augustine, writing against the doctrines of Pelagius, "that faculty were inferior which God Himself placed in our nature; while the other two which as he (Pelagius) would have it, are our own property, are so strong and firm and self-sufficient as to require none of His help! so that He does not help us to will, nor help us to act, but simply helps us to the possibility of willing and acting."[1]

And it should also be noted that the very help which Pelagius taught assisted our natural capacity or so-called *possibility*, he placed in the *law* and the *doctrine*.

In short, it will be seen that Pelagius confines the practice of grace to the assisting the power of the natural will—*possibilitatem adjuvat*,[2] assuming an independent power in the will to which grace is added. He maintained an external grace as distinguished from an internal, and a grace which depends entirely on an independent act of the will for its acceptance and exercise as dis-

[1] *De Gratia Christi*, lib. i., cap. 6.

[2] "Nos sic tria ista distinguimus, et certum velut in ordinem digesta partimur. Primo loco posse statuemus, secundo velle, tertio esse. Posse in naturâ, velle in arbitrio, esse in effectu locamus. Primum illud, id est, posse, ad Deum proprie pertinet, qui illud creaturæ suæ contulit; duo vero reliqua, hoc est, velle et esse ad hominem referenda sunt, quia de arbitrii fonte descendunt. Ergo in voluntate et in opere bono laus hominis est; imo et hominis et Dei, qui ipsius voluntatis et operis possibilitatem dedit, quique ipsam possibilitatem gratiæ suæ adjuvat semper auxilio."—Pelagius, *de lib. Arb. apud Aug. de Grat. Christi*, n. 5.

tinguished from a grace (as maintained by Augustine) which supplies that act and secures its own use.

His idea of moral freedom was freedom of choice, the faculty of deciding at each moment alike between good and evil—of choosing one of the two. Augustine, on the other hand, looked upon man as already determined within himself by his disposition before he proceeds to act, and thought that at the highest point of moral advancement freedom and necessity meet together, and that the rational being acts with true freedom only in determining himself according to the inward law of his moral nature.

Augustine presupposes a corruption of the moral powers; his system of grace is based on this, and it is here that he comes most prominently in antagonism to the system of Pelagius. Augustine in his epistle to Vitalis, one of the last he wrote, probably, and when his system was thoroughly matured, lays down twelve articles which form the fundamental part of his doctrine. They are:—

1. We know that before men were born into this world, they had no other state wherein they did either good or evil. But descending from Adam according to the flesh, they partake, by their birth, of the poison of that ancient death which he became subject to by his sin; and that they are not delivered from eternal death, except they are regenerated in Jesus Christ through His grace.

2. We know that the grace of God is not given on account of any merit, either to infants, or to men who are come to the age of reason.

3. We know that grace is an assistance afforded for every action, to those who have attained to the age of reason.

4. We know that it is not given to all men, and that those to whom it is given receive it without having deserved it by their works, or by their will, which appears particularly in infants.

5. We know that it is out of God's mere mercy that it is given to those to whom it is given.

6. We know that it is by a just judgment of God that it is not given to those to whom it is not given.

7. We know that we shall all appear before the judgment-seat of Jesus Christ, that everyone may receive either reward or punishment according to what he shall have done in the body, and not according to what he should have done had he lived longer.

8. We know that infants shall not receive recompense or punishment but according to what they shall have done in the body; that is, whilst they were in the body; that is, according as some have been regenerate, and others not.

9. We know that eternal happiness is ensured to all those that die in Jesus Christ; and that nothing is imputed to them of what they might have done, had they been alive.

10. We know that as many as believe in God believe willingly, and by an action of their freewill.

11. We know that we ought to pray unto God for those that believe not, that they might believe.

12. We know that whensoever any of these embraces the faith, we are to give God thanks sincerely and from the bottom of our hearts, as being an effect of His mercy, and that when we do it as we are wont to do, we perform a duty incumbent on us.

It is only as we are able to see the fearful and far-reaching effects of the fall that we can acknowledge the necessity for the Divine principle of life, transforming man's nature in its present state. Pelagius, in failing to do the former, overlooked the latter, and confused nature with grace. Regarding nature and its capacities and powers as practically unimpaired by the fall, he considered that all that was requisite was that man should apply the powers conferred upon him by God, and become what he was destined for. The ability he admitted to be from above, but for the exercise of that ability, nothing beyond the man was necessary. He made the grace of Christ consist solely in the bestowal of forgiveness, leaving man after he had obtained this to his own freewill, ignoring, or at least not giving proper effect to the new principle of Divine life which is the spring of all true goodness, or the continual operation of the Holy Spirit in the sanctification of the pardoned sinner. Pelagius evidently did not see the necessity for this continual operation of the Holy Spirit. His position was, that God having once created the world and endowed His creatures with capacities and powers for their development permitted it to go on according to the laws implanted in their natures, so that the continuous operation of the Divine agency had reference only to the preservation of these capacities and powers, but not to any *concursus* in order to their proper exercise and due development.

Augustine, on the other hand, looked on God's preservation of the creature as a continuous active operation—a preservation in which from moment to moment the Divine hand is present and working.[1] The charge against the Pelagians was that their views placed man in independence of God. But in these broad terms the charge was certainly not sustainable. Yet was it in truth the very essence of their system; for it did not give that force to the dependence of the creature on the Creator—the redeemed on the Saviour, which is the faith of the Christian Church.

Pelagius and his followers denied all those physical and moral consequences of the fall on the entire human race which were

[1] "A God who does not reveal Himself ceases to be God: and religious feeling, craving after a living relation to its object, refuses to be satisfied with a mere initial or potential revelation of the mind and will of God—with a God who speaks once for all, and then through the whole course of history ceases to reveal Himself."—Dr. Caird, *Intro. to the Philosophy of Religion*, p. 65.

asserted by Augustine. They looked upon the imputation of another's sin as conflicting with God's justice, and the propagation of guilt as conflicting with the essential ideas of sin and freewill. They admitted, as has been already said, that Adam had injured his posterity by his example, but would go no further than this. They supposed all operations of grace to be conditioned on the bent of the freewill, and all means of grace to be effectual only according to the measure of the different tendencies of the will; further they denied all constraining influences of grace on the will.

Another view taken of the effect of grace was that of the Semi-Pelagians, who held that inward preventing grace was not necessary to form in the soul the first beginning of true repentance and amendment, but that everyone was capable of producing these by the mere power of his natural faculties, as also of exercising faith in Christ and forming the purposes of a holy and sincere obedience. It is true they admitted that none could persevere or advance in that holy and virtuous course without the continual support and assistance of divine grace, but the first turn or conversion to the will of God they considered to be the effect of man's own free choice.

The Schoolmen seem to have regarded original righteousness as something superadded to the original nature of man, and not as having been a part of that nature. Original sin therefore was in their view a loss or privation of original righteousness, and the effect of the fall was consequently not so much to bring into human nature that which was displeasing in the sight of God, as to deprive it of that which mainly made it acceptable before. They considered, indeed, that the body was affected either from the poison of the forbidden fruit or some other cause; but that the soul suffered by privation only, being denuded of the supernatural righteousness and the presence of God which had been vouchsafed to Adam at his original creation. The view taken by the Fathers almost universally had been that Adam's original righteousness consisted both in natural innocence and the grace of God—it was not only absence of sin, but the presence of God's Spirit, both of which were lost at the fall. In the Council of Trent it was decreed:—(1) That Adam by transgressing lost holiness and justice, incurred the wrath of God, death, thraldom to the devil, and was infected both in soul and body. (2) That Adam derived to his posterity death of body and sin of soul. (3) That sin, transmitted by generation, not by imitation, can be abolished by no remedy but the death of Christ, and that the merit of Christ is applied to children in baptism, as well as to adults. (4) That newly-born children ought to be baptised as having contracted sin from Adam. (5) That by the grace of baptism the guilt of original sin is remitted and that all is removed which hath the true and proper

nature of sin, and though the concupiscence remaining is called by the Apostle sin, the Synod declared that it was not true and proper sin, but was so termed because it ariseth from sin and inclineth to it. On the point of the entire cancelling of original sin in baptism, the Lutheran and Article IX. are not in harmony with the decree of the Council of Trent, setting forth as they do that the infection of sin remains even in the *renati*, and that though there is no condemnation to them that believe and are baptised, yet still lust or concupiscence has the nature of sin. The Arminians took a view somewhat between the Calvinists and the Socinians. They denied that the corruption of man was so great that no spark of moral goodness was left in him, but admitted the great corruption of his heart and intellect. They considered that some remains of his original condition might be traced in him, and that though his mind and will were depraved and incapable of making any independent effort towards godliness, yet he had a natural conscience and a free will to do either good or evil.

The true doctrine lies scattered among the above views, somewhat between the extreme opinions. It will be found that though a propensity to evil, most powerful and seductive in effect, has been by the fall transmitted to all mankind, yet all distinction between right and wrong has not been obliterated from the human mind. The will still retains liberty for the performance of civil duties in this present life, and for the choice of those things lying within the control of reason. The understanding has become darkened, and its powers impaired, and a tendency to evil has supplanted the principle of rectitude which once reigned supreme within; but still man has been left a rational and a responsible being. The bright characters of unspotted sanctity once deeply engraved on his mind having been obliterated, the injury affected every part of man's being—his spirit, soul, and body. We entirely disagree with the Schoolmen who taught that the infection of our nature is merely a corporeal taint, that the body alone receives and transmits the contagion, while the soul in all instances proceeds immaculate from the hands of its Creator.[1] Yet at the same time

[1] When they speak of all men being in the first man, they explain it by saying that whatever is in human bodies existed "materially and in the way of causation in the first man." So, according to Peter Lombard, Adam transmitted a portion of his substance to his descendants, which has continued the same, only being augmented in bulk by food without receiving any external addition, and being continued downwards from him by successive multiplications of itself. Quibus responderi potest, quod materialiter atque causaliter, non formaliter, dicitur fuisse in primo homine, omne quod in humanis corporibus naturaliter est, descenditque a primo parente lege propagationis, et in se auctum et multiplicatum est, nulla exteriori substantia in id transeunte; et ipsum in futuro resurget. Fomentum quidem habet a cibis, sed non convertuntur cibi in humanam substantiam, quæ scilicet per propagationem descendit ab Adam. Transmisit enim Adam modicum quid de substantia sua in corpora filiorum, quando eos procreavit; id est, aliquid modicum de massa substantiæ ejus divisum est, et inde formatum corpus filii, suique multiplicatione, sine rei extrinsecæ adjectione, auctum est: et de illo ita augmentato aliquid inde separatur, unde formantur posterorum corpora: et ita

we cannot admit that the effect of the fall was such as to affect man's accountability to his God. His will, though fallen from its integrity, has still the grace of true optional power, but is so much corrupted and degenerated as never to choose the good of itself. Though free, it has become a bad will, and when exercised without the intervention or the influence of the Holy Spirit, it chooses those things which are evil. The will is biased by inclination—an inclination to evil rather than to good.

The fall then did not deprive man of the power of exercising moral freedom, but it became necessary that God's grace should thenceforth come to the support of the creature in a more pronounced and peculiar mode. The creature had thenceforth less within himself to depend on and more to look to his Creator for—in short he needed to look to the Redeemer, not merely to the Creator --he required not merely creative grace but redemptive also.

For the eyes of our first parents had been opened to the contemplation of evil as well as good— their knowledge had, alas! been greatly multiplied, but not their joy, the call now was not to stand in the good and not fall into the evil, but to forsake the evil in which they were involved, and the utter darkness into which their natural inclinations now drew them. Their freewill undoubtedly remained as a part of their nature—an inseparable part so long as that nature was in God's sight to remain accountable,

progreditur procreationis ordo lege propagationis, usque ad finem humani generis. Itaque diligenter ac perspicue intelligentibus patet, omnes secundum corpora in Adam fuisse per seminalem rationem, et ex eo descendisse propagationis lege.—Pet. Lomb. Sent. lib. ii. dist. 30.

What they taught on this subject is well and concisely summed up by Archbishop Laurence in his Brampton Lectures:—Original Sin they directly opposed to original Righteousness; and this they considered not as something connatural with man, but as a superinduced habit or adventitious ornament, the removal of which according to the philosophical principles of the Stagirite, could not prove detrimental to the native powers of his mind. Hence they stated the former simply to be the loss or want of the latter; of an accomplishment unessential to his nature, of which it might be deprived, yet still retain its integrity inviolate. When, therefore, they contemplated the effects of the fall, by confining the evil to a corporeal taint, and not extending it to the nobler faculties of the soul, they regarded man as an object of divine displeasure, not because he possessed that, which was offensive, but because he was defective in that, which was pleasing to the Almighty. While, however, they laboured to diminish the effects, they augmented in equal proportion the responsibility of the first transgression, asserting, that all participated in the guilt of Adam. He, they said, received for himself and his posterity the gift of righteousness, which he subsequently forfeited; in his loins we were included, and by him were virtually represented, his will was ours, and hence the consequence of his lapse is justly imputable to us his descendants. By our natural birth therefore, under this idea, we are alienated from God, innocent in our individual persons, but guilty in that of him from whom we derived our existence; a guilt, which, although contracted through the fault of another, yet so closely adheres to us, that it effectually precludes our entrance at the gate of everlasting life, until the reception of a new birth in baptism. Thus they contended that the lapse of Adam conveys to us solely imputed guilt; the corporeal infection, which they admitted, not being sin itself, but only the subject matter of it; not *peccatum*, but, according to their phraseology, *fomes peccati*, a kind of fuel, which the human will kindles or not at pleasure. It required, however, no common talent at paradoxical solution to prove, what was pertinaciously held, the innocence of that occult quality, which disposes to crime without being itself criminal, which, void of all depravity, renders the mind depraved; that metaphorical fuel of the affections, which, although not vicious in its own nature, yet, when inflamed, generates vice in the heart, upon which it preys."—4th Ed., pp. 55—59.

and this notwithstanding the defilement and ruin which encircled it, and the sentence of death under which they stood.

The essential character of their human powers was unaltered by the fall. Adam was as truly a free agent after the transgression as before, because he was equally free from all constraint or restraint in his actions, and invariably did the things that he would. The difference was this: In his state of primitive innocence he had freewill to do good or evil, and a freewill inclined to good, accompanied by an enlightened understanding, a right disposition of heart, and holy affections to God—yet not by any natural necessity incapable of choosing evil, as this were destructive of his very nature. After the fall, freewill still exists, but the will is inclined to evil through the force of depravity. Freedom remains, but evil lusts instead of holy dispositions, ignorance instead of true knowledge, accompany it, and therefore the sinner wills, and wills freely evil and not good. The fallen creature requires continual grace for its probationary career, and in order to check its natural tendencies to evil and to keep the will in subjection and obedience to the will of the Almighty as that will is revealed by express revelation or the dictates of the natural conscience. The difficulty of walking with God has been increased exactly by the tendency not to do so which is now part of the nature of the creature.[1]

God ever gives sufficient grace—grace known as preventing grace to all, that all may turn to Him. His Holy Spirit is ever striving with us. As we cannot do anything that is good without the assistance of God Himself, so we cannot do anything that is good until we have first turned to Him. Even works which might be termed good as the result from Nature have the nature of sin, *peccati rationem habent*,—belonging as they do to the unregenerate principle which is called sin. Scripture practically asserts this when it says, "Without faith, it is impossible to please God;"[2] Faith itself is His precious gift.[3]

Professor Drummond[4] has a fine passage on the absurdity of the modern school which protests against the doctrine of man's inability as the "heartless fiction of a past theology." He says, "The entire dependence of the soul upon God is not an exceptional mystery, nor is man's helplessness an arbitrary and unprecedented phenomenon. It is the law of all Nature. The spiritual man is not taxed

[1] Gennadius says, "that though man by the fall has lost *vigorem arbitrii*, the vigour of the freewill, yet has he not lost his choice, lest it should not be of his choice that he avoided sin, nor shall that be accounted to him for reward which he had not freely put away; there remains, therefore, yet to fallen man a freedom of will to seek after his salvation, though God must first admonish and invite him to do so"—non tamen electionem, ne non esset suum quod evitaret peccatum, nec merito indulgeretur quod non arbitrio diluisset; manet ergo ad quærendam salutem arbitrii libertas, sed admonente prius Deo et invitante. *De Dogm. Eccl.*, cap. 21.

[2] Heb. xi. 6.

[3] Eph. ii. 8.—is not the most direct authority for this—this text though frequently quoted to this end, but proves that "*Salvation* is the gift of God."

[4] Natural Law in the Spiritual World.

beyond the natural. He is not purposely handicapped by singular limitations or unusual incapacities. God has not designedly made the religious life as hard as possible. The arrangements for the spiritual life are the same as for the natural life. When in their hours of unbelief men challenge their Creator for placing the obstacle of human frailty in the way of their highest development, their protest is against the nature of nature. They object to the sun for being the source of energy and not the engine, to the carbonic acid being in the air and not in the plant. They would equip each organism with a personal atmosphere, each brain with a private store of energy; they would grow corn in the interior of the body, and make bread by a special operation in the digestive organs. They must, in short, have the creature transformed into a creator. The organism must either depend on his environment or be self-sufficient. But who will not rather approve the arrangement by which man in his creatural life may have unbroken access to an Infinite Power? What soul will seek to remain self-luminous when it knows that 'the Lord God is a *Sun*'? Who would not willingly exchange his shallow vessel for Christ's well of living water? Even if the organism, launched into being like a ship putting out to sea, possesses a full equipment, its little store must soon come to an end. But in contact with a large and bounteous environment its supply is limitless. In every direction its resourses are infinite."

What is required of man is that he should submit his freewill to the Will of the Almighty. God has a purpose to accomplish in man, and it can only be accomplished by the breaking down of his independent will through sorrow and death willingly endured. The great pattern and example set before us ever submitted His will to the will of His Father, "yet not My will but Thine be done." As He said Himself, "I come not to do My own will, but the will of Him that sent Me."[1] Faith is the laying down of man's will and the taking up of God's will—it is the laying down of that on which the condemnation rests, and the taking up of that on which there is no condemnation—the exchange of that which is seen, of that which is pleasant to look upon, for that which is unseen, eternal in the heavens.

This is the great exercise of faith, for the submission of our will to the will of God, is a spiritual act. Take for example the case of the father of the Faithful. When Abraham was called upon to offer his son Isaac the justifying act of faith was, that having before him God's will on the one hand and every personal interest, desire and inclination on the other, he resisted all such opposing influences, and submitted his will in obedience to God's will. There is always an act of the will, as we have already seen, anterior to all outward action—and this is the act of choosing

[1] John vi. 38.

between God's will and our own, an act which takes place in the spirit. It is this act of the will existing in the spirit anterior to outward action, choosing between the doing of God's will or our own, which forms an inner and distinct spiritual reality. It is this act which finds expression in the outward action and constitutes its righteousness or its sin. Every temptation gives occasion to a conflict between the claims of the two wills—a conflict which is wholly within the spirit and must be determined there before the outward act finds expression. A struggle, a continuous struggle has to be maintained, for the inclination ever is to the evil, while the command of the Lord is to the good. The grace of God, however, is always present to confirm and strengthen His monitor within—ever ready to be poured into the hearts of those who will trust in Him at all times as their only Sustainer and Preserver.

The man who casts himself on God's mercy, who submits himself to the will of God, confessing his utter inability without His help to turn or maintain his face steadily in the path of life, does so only by the grace of God, but he is nevertheless a free agent. He receives according to his faith and obedience the fuller blessing which the Almighty is ever ready to bestow. On the other hand, the man who refuses to cast himself on God's mercy, who obstinately relies solely on himself and his own powers and looks not for help to God, will be left to his own devices. In the exercise of his own freewill he elects to live in disregard of God and in independence of Him—his end is according to his folly and his recompense to be without the presence of God throughout eternity! God's grace would have been experienced had the man submitted his will in obedience to the divine grace, for though not irresistible it was sufficient to enable him to turn and obey his God. The will was free either to co-operate or not with the grace, it chose to act independently and revelled in the path of destruction. If it be thought that here there is entrance for self-sufficiency, at least in the case of the man who turns to God, let it be remembered that the only mode of his righteous action is by self-renunciation and faith towards God, and this can leave but little room, if any, for self-righteousness.

No man can say he is destitute of grace, that power is given to another of turning to God which is denied to him, without self-contradiction and self-condemnation; for this would be equivalent to saying that he is in a condition of conscious disobedience and wilful error, for which he is liable to condemnation, and that condemnation would only be the greater on account of the individual attributing his evil condition to the want of God's grace. It has been truly said[1] that our admission of the source of grace is the reflex act of our substantive being in the upright

[1] McCleland, "Pred. and Freewill," p. 124.

use of reason, will and conscience, the life of faith, which—not through any natural strength of ours, but by God's grace towards us in Christ—is in, or is striving to be in, every man. The righteousness of obedience and the unrighteousness of disobedience are especially our own, because it is from the depths of our own being that they spring; while the former owes its genuine character to its disclaiming self-origination; as the latter likewise does, to its resting in and being satisfied with self.

All this is agreeable to what the Article says as to the condition of man under the Fall. "The condition of man after the fall of Adam is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself by his own natural strength and good works to faith and calling upon God, 'ad fidem et invocationem Dei'"[1]; that is, a man cannot by the exercise of his natural faculties and unassisted by the grace of God correct the corruption derived from the fall of Adam. The Article then goes on, "wherefore we have no power to do good works pleasant and acceptable unto God without the grace of Christ preventing us that we may have a good will, and working with us when we have that good will." This preventing and assisting grace, we have seen, God gives to all. David prayed that God would "open and turn his eyes," "unite and incline his heart," "create in him a clean heart and renew a right spirit within him"[2]; and Solomon says that He gives wisdom; that He directs men's paths, and giveth grace to the lowly.[3] It is the grace of God going before which gives rise to all our good endeavours. It acts not compulsorily or irresistibly but assistingly. The Article is quite borne out by the statements of St. Augustine: "Neither," says he, "does a man begin to be converted or changed from evil to good by the beginning of faith, unless the unbought and gratuitous mercy of God work this in him."[4] And again, "So therefore let the grace of God be thought upon so that from the beginning of his good changing even to the end of his perfection, he who glorieth may glory in the Lord. Because as none can begin a good work without the Lord, so none can perfect it without the Lord."[5]

Maxentius is equally distinct: "We believe," says he, "that the natural freewill is able to do no more than to discern and desire carnal or worldly things; which not with God, yet perhaps

[1] The Lutherans always united faith and invocation considering the lattter as ineffectual without the former. "Jam qui scit, se per Christum habere propitium patrem, is vere novit Deum, scit se ei curæ esse, *invocare Deum.* Denique non est sine Deo, sicut Gentes . . . . . *Sine fide* nullo modo potest humana natura *primi aut secundi præcepti opera facere. Sine fide non invocat Deum.*"—Augsb. Conf. ed. 1520.

[2] Ps. cxix. 18, 27, 32, 35; Ps. li. 10, 11.

[3] Prov. ii. 6; iii. 34.

[4] Nec omnino incipit homo ex malo in bonum per initium fidei commutari, nisi hoc in illo agat indebita et gratuita misericordia Dei.—Aug. contra duas epist. Pelag. lib ii. cap. 23 [viii.].

[5] Sic itaque Dei gratia cogitetur, ut ab initio bonæ mutationis suæ usque in finem consummationis, qui gloriatur in Domino glorietur. Quia sicut nemo potest bonum inchoare sine Domino, sic nemo perficere sine Domino.—*Ibid.*

amongst men may seem glorious; but those things which belong to eternal life, it can neither think, nor will, nor desire, nor perform, but only by the infusion and inward working of the Holy Ghost, which is also the Spirit of Christ."[1]

So says Fulgentius, "He delivered us not by finding faith in any man, but by giving it."[2] And again, "But it is clear that in order that a man should begin to believe in God, he receives from God repentance unto life; so that he could not believe at all unless he received repentance by the gift of the merciful God. But what is man's repentance but the changing of the will? God therefore that gives man repentance also changes his will."[3]

The same view is taken in the prayers—in the Collect for Easter Day, we humbly beseech Almighty God that as by His special grace *preventing* us He doth put into our minds good desires, &c.; and in the Collect for the 17th Sunday after Trinity we pray that His grace may always *prevent* and follow us and make us continually to be given to all good works. And in another Collect we say, "Prevent us, O Lord, in all our doings with Thy most gracious favour, and further us with Thy continual help," &c.

These views are in entire harmony with the declaration of the Confession of Augsburg; and no doubt the tenth Article was framed on the 18th Article of that Confession, which runs as follows: "Concerning freewill our churches teach that the human will possesses some liberty for the performance of civil duties, and for the choice of those things lying within the control of reason. But it does not possess the power without the influence of the Holy Spirit of being just before God, or yielding spiritual obedience: for the natural man receiveth not the things which are of the Spirit of God, but this is accomplished in the heart, when the Holy Spirit is received through the word." The same is declared by Augustine in similar words: "We confess that the will of man is free, having indeed the judgment of reason, not by which it may, in those things that pertain to God, be able without Him either to begin or accomplish anything; but only in actions, good as well as evil, of this present life. By good, I mean those which arise from the good of nature; for instance, the desire to labour, to eat and drink, to have a friend, have clothing, build a house, marry a wife, feed

[1] Liberum naturale arbitrium ad nihil aliud valere credimus nisi ad discernenda tantum et desideranda carnalia sive secularia; quæ non apud Deum sed apud homines possunt fortassis videri gloriosa; ad ea vero quæ ad vitam æternam pertinent nec cogitare, nec velle, nec desiderare, nec perficere posse, nisi per infusionem et inoperationem intrinsecus Spiritus Sancti, qui est etiam Spiritus Christi.—Maxent. *Conf. fidei. Bibl. Max. Patr.* vol. ix., p. 537.

[2] Liberavit autem non in quolibet homine fidem inveniendo sed dando. Fulg. *de incar. et grat. Christi.* Cap. xvii.

[3] Claret tamen quia ut homo in Deum credere incipiat Deo accipit pœnitentiam ad vitam, ita ut omnino credere non possit, nisi pœnitentiam dono Dei miserantis acceperit. Quæ est autem pœnitentia hominis nisi mutatio voluntatis? Deus ergo qui homini pœnitentiam dat, ipse mutat hominis voluntatem.—*Ibid.* So Bernard in his treatise *On Grace and Freewill*, chap. 1, says, "God is the Author of salvation. Freewill is only capable of it."

cattle, learn the arts of divers good things, to choose anything which concerns this present life: all which, however, do not subsist independently of the Divine government; nay, rather, they are of, and owe their being to Him. But by evil, I mean the desire to worship an idol, conceive murder, &c., &c. They condemn the Pelagians and others, who teach that it is possible, by the sole power of nature, without the aid of the Holy Spirit, to love God above all things and to do His commands. For although nature may be able to do, after a certain manner, external actions, as to keep one's hands from theft, from murder, &c., yet it cannot perform the inner motions such as the fear of God, faith in God, chastity, patience, &c."[1]

It is clear then that whenever God requires faith and good works, He will not withhold the aid of that preventing and co-operaing grace without which they cannot be attained. As Augustine very concisely puts it, "He operates without us in order that we may become willing, but when we possess the will and so use it as to act, He operates with us."[2] We have the assurance of this in our Saviour's invitation: "Come unto Me all ye that labour and are heavy laden and I will give you rest."[3] "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask Him?"[5] These and many other passages show that the Holy Spirit ever attends the gracious call of the Gospel, and that if men are not wilfully and obstinately closing their ears and hardening their hearts against belief, they may rejoice in hearing and receive. They are not irresistibly compelled to believe, any more than they are restrained from believing. The power to reject salvation is in themselves—the power to believe and be saved is the gift of God alone, but freely offered to all. Preventing grace is to awaken and dispose, and enables the individual to turn to God, but that it may be resisted is best evidenced by the fact that the greater part of mankind do resist it. It points out

[1] De libero arbitrio docent, quod humana voluntas habeat aliquam libertatem ad efficiendam civilem justitiam, et diligendas res ratione subjectas. Sed non habet vim sine Spiritu Sancto efficiendæ justitiæ Dei, seu justitiæ spiritualis quia animalis homo non percipit ea, quæ sunt Spiritus Dei; sed hæc fit in cordibus, cum per verbum Spiritus Sanctus concipitur. Hæc totidem verbis dicit Augustinus lib. 3 Hypognosticon. Esse fatemur liberum arbitrium omnibus hominibus, habens quidem judicium rationis, non per quod sit idoneum in iis, quæ ad Deum pertinent, sine Deo aut inchoare aut certè peragere, sed tantum in operibus vitæ præsentis tam bonis, quam etiam malis; Bonis dico, quæ de bono naturæ oriuntur, *i.e.* velle laborare in agro, velle manducare et bibere, velle habere amicum, velle habere indumenta, velle fabricare domum, uxorem velle ducere, pecora nutrire, artem discere diversarum rerum bonarum, velle quicquid bonum ad præsentem pertinet vitam. Quæ omnia non sine divino gubernaculo subsistunt, imò ex ipso et per ipsum sunt et esse cœperant. Malis verò dico, ut est; velle idolum colere, velle homicidium, etc. Damnant Pelagianos, et alios, qui docent, quod sine Spiritu Sancto, solis naturæ viribus, possimus Deum super omnia diligere, item præcepta Dei facere, quoad substantiam actuum. Quanquam enim externa opera aliquo modo efficere natura possit: potest enim continere manus a furto, a cæde; tamen interiores motus non potest efficere, ut timorem Dei, fiduciam erga Deum, castitatem, patientiam, etc.

[2] De Gratia et libero Arbitrio cap. xxxiii [xvii].

[3] Matt. xi. 28. [4] Luke xi. 13. [5] Matt. xiii. 15.

the way of eternal life, leaving it to the recipient to follow or not. Irresistible grace is repugnant to the acknowledged principles of the Gospel.

Grace has been divided into *sufficient* and *efficacious*. Sufficient grace is that which, although it affords sufficient power to produce the effect for which it is given, does not act so as to compel the will of the recipient. This grace is bestowed on all men, it is the "true light which coming into the world lighteth all men."[1] It is referred to in the passage, "My grace is sufficient for thee,"[2] and "I can do all things through Christ that strengtheneth me."[3] Efficacious grace is that which infallibly produces the result for which it is bestowed and infers the co-operation of the freewill. Ezekiel speaks of this grace in these terms: "I will put My Spirit upon you, that ye may walk in My commands."[4]

Luther and Calvin considered that all grace was efficacious, and efficacious in the sense that practically it obliterated the freewill, and with them Baius and Jansen agreed.

It must be borne in mind that Calvinists refer to the Doctrine of Grace as if it were peculiar to their system, and as if a rejection of their system involved a denial of the catholic doctrine of grace. But this is an error. They hold a *peculiar* doctrine of grace—a doctrine which leads to Calvinistic election with its correlative preterition, particular redemption, and final perseverance, a doctrine foreign to Holy Scripture—far indeed removed from the blessed doctrine there enunciated.

The question is not as to whether God *can* compel the will of man, but whether he does or not. Reason tells us that were He to do so, He would violate the order which He has set in our creation, He would destroy His own creature. He made man after His own image, invested him with a reasonable soul, having a power of understanding and a freedom of will. He gave him the power of deliberation and choice and made him master of his own actions. To force his will would be to destroy the powers He has given. This then He will not do. He created a free agent, and with a free agent He will deal, preventing and assisting him with His grace and precepts and leading him gently forward in the paths of understanding and light, but so long as the Almighty holds His creature responsible for his actions, He will not coerce and force his will.

It is one thing to give a man power to act and another to force him to act. In the first there is place for his will, in the second, none. Men are saved by grace, because without God's help and assistance they could never attain everlasting life. But it is no less true that they work out their own salvation, for did they not exert their powers the grace of God would pass them by. We

[1] John i. 9.
[2] 2 Cor. xii. 9.
[3] Phil. iv. 13.
[4] Ezek. xxxvi. 27.

are told that the Spirit helpeth our infirmities, it assists our will—does not set it aside.[1] The Greek word συναντιλαμβανεται expresses the co-operation much more clearly than the English "helpeth." It not only expresses how God's Spirit does His part, συν "with" us, but also αντι, "over against" us. As Dr. Doddridge says, it literally expresses the action of one who helps another to bear a burden, by taking hold of it on one side, and lifting or bearing it with him; and so it seems to intimate the obligation on us to exert our little strength feeble as it is, in concurrence with His Almighty aid. And the Apostle gives expression to the same idea in another place,[2] "We are συνεργοι, workers together with God."

While we use the word co-operation as referring to the concurrence of Divine and human agency we are aware that it is a term somewhat open to objection, and it is not quite expressive of the true idea. To render this clearer let us consider into what distinct classes the *facienda* (things to be done) in effecting the salvation and sanctification of man may be divided. They are three in number:—1st, those things which are done *for* us; 2nd, those things which are done *in* us; and 3rd, those things which are done *by* us. In the first class, are the incarnation, death, resurrection, ascension, and intercession of our Lord. In the second are "The washing of regeneration by the renewing of the Holy Ghost," the gift of faith, repentance, the formation and growth of Christ within, and the continual sanctifying operation of the Holy Ghost who dwelleth in the elect of God. In the third, are the putting forth of the grace and power conferred upon us, the using aright the talents with which we have been intrusted, and the bringing forth the fruits of the Spirit to the glory of God's Holy name. Now, it is clear that God and man do not work together in the same act or in the same sort of act. For instance, in the first and second classes above, God is the actor, man is but the subject; they do not work together in the same act; and in the third not in the same sort of act. For instance, God *gives* faith, but man *exercises* it. Here God is alone in *His* act, and man alone in his; for man does not *give* faith, nor does God *exercise* faith. So again, Christ *gives* repentance and man *repents*. God is alone in His gift, and man in his exercise—for man does not *give* repentance, neither does Christ *repent*. And not only is the work of God and of man different in itself, but they are not coincident as to time, for man's operations are consequent and dependent upon God's gifts and operations. God draws us before we follow Him. *His* call precedes our following.

When therefore we use the word co-operation it must be understood that we do so simply for want of a better, that we fully and freely admit that what God does He does effectually and without

[1] Rom. viii. 26. [2] 1 Cor. iii. 9; Mark xvi. 20.

the need of any auxiliary concurrence on the part of the creature in the accomplishment of His works.

It is absurd arrogance to divide the praise of any good work between God and man, attempting to assign such part to God and such part to man; for the whole is due to God, even though some is due to man in subordination to God: for that which is man's is God's, because, as the Apostle says, "we have nothing but what we have received."[1]

To think that man has not his part to do is a sad mistake, and leads to Antimonianism. Recall for one moment a few passages of Holy Scripture. "To him that ordereth his conversation aright will I show the salvation of God."[2] Is ordering the conversation aright nothing? "Repent ye and be converted that your sins may be blotted out."[3] Are repentance and conversion nothing? "Come unto Me all ye that are heavy laden and I will give you rest."[4] Is coming nothing? "Ask, and ye shall receive; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you."[5] Are asking, seeking, and knocking nothing? Free grace says, "Seek ye My face," and freewill answers "Thy face, Lord, will I seek."[6]

From the very nature of the soul it is evident that we are and ever must be freewilling creatures. This is necessary to our moral accountability, and an inseparable part of our spiritual constitution.[7]

The Scriptural doctrine of Freewill lies between the error of Pelagius and that of Manes. St. Augustine contended with both these men. In his contention with the Manicheans, who were strongly opposed to the freedom of the human will, Augustine maintains freewill with Pelagius; and in his contention with the Pelagians who were stern upholders of the freedom of the human will in such a way as to ignore the necessity for the operation of Divine grace, he maintains the bondage of the will with the Manicheans.

In the Scriptural and true doctrine of freewill there is room

[1] 1 Cor. iv. 7.
[2] Ps. l. 23.
[3] Acts iii. 19.
[4] Matt. xi. 28.
[5] Matt. vii. 7.
[6] Ps. xxvii. 8.

[7] There are four views of the combination or operation of the freewill of man and the grace of God.

1. Without the grace of God, the will of man can, and does both will and perform that which is good.

This is the heresy of Pelagius.

2. Without the grace of God man, by the mere power of his natural faculties, and without preventing grace, might turn to God and exercise faith in Christ, but could not persevere or advance in the course begun of himself without Divine aid.

This is the heresy of the Semi-Pelagians.

3. By or through the grace of God working on the will, the will of man can both will and perform that which is good; and without grace it cannot will nor without further grace perform that which is good.

This is the view of the Catholic Church.

4. By or through the grace of God working on the will, the will of man cannot but will, cannot but perform that which is good.

This is the extreme view of Augustine, which he adopted in his dispute with Pelagius. It leads of necessity to the doctrine of final perseverance—it is in fact irresistible grace.

for the Divine grace of the Holy Spirit influencing each to turn to God and choose a life of holiness rather than of iniquity. As St. Augustine in his better mode says, "The human will is not taken away by the grace of God; but it is changed from a bad will into a good will, and when it has become a good will it is assisted."[1] And in another place we are forbidden "so to maintain God's grace as to seem to take away freewill; or on the other hand, so to assist its liberty as to lay ourselves open to the censure of being ungrateful to the grace of God, in the arrogance of our impiety."[2]

Both grace on the part of God and freewill on the part of man must ever be found expressed in harmonious working, for so long as a moral government exists in heaven, so long it cannot be denied that in the consensus of the human mind the moral quality of an action depends upon the freedom of the agent. If there be a *physical necessity* it would be absurd to impute blame to the party so forcibly impelled, and if there be a *moral necessity*,[3] the causes may be almost equally powerful, and it would be impossible to hold the agent responsible for his actions. In one sense it may be said that there is no such thing as *moral necessity;* for were we constrained to either good or evil, these terms would be lost to us. If we were shut up, so to speak, by a *moral necessity*, our actions would lose their quality of moral or immoral.

Praise and blame, reward and punishment uniformly imply that we consider the individual who is the recipient of such to be a free and responsible agent—that we deem it quite possible he might have acted otherwise than he did: and so soon as we discover that he acted under compulsion, whether arising from a physical or moral necessity, we can no longer estimate

[1] Gratiam Dei,—qua voluntas humana non tollitur, sed ex mala mutatur in bonam; et cum bona fuerit adjuvatur. Aug., de Grat. et liber. Arbit. c. 20.

[2] *See* De Peccat. Mer. et Remis., lib. ii. cap. xxviii.; De Gratiâ Christi 52; and De Grat. et libero Arbitrio, I.

[3] The word "necessity" is used in so many different senses that it is well to make the sense in which the word is used distinctly understood. Archbishop Whately has some valuable observations on the word which he has put in an appendix to his edition of Dr. King's Discourse on Predestination. He says, "The word 'necessary' is used, I. Sometimes to denote the universality or constancy of the connexion between any two things, and consequently, in any *general* assertion, to imply merely that what we say is true without any exception or qualification: II. Sometimes to denote *compulsion*, or independence of our will: and III. Sometimes to denote our *knowledge* respecting the matter in question, and our having no room for *doubt* about it. What has been said may serve as a clue to explain the confused notions of many of the advocates for what is called the system of necessity: and, I may add, of many of its opponents also. 'If God forsees our actions,' it is said, 'they are necessary,' and if they are 'necessary' we are not 'free.' Now in this second clause the word 'necessary' is transferred to the secondary sense of 'compulsory' or 'involuntary'; whereas the 'necessity' (if we choose to call it so) which is implied by the events being *foreknown*, only means, if we employ the phrase with any kind of precision, the correspondence of that event to that knowledge:—its being such as it is known to be; so that 'necessary' is here merely equivalent to 'real,' in opposition to 'ideal' or 'imaginary.' If, in any case, it *depends on us* to do, or to abstain from doing, anything, and we have a decided inclination—a predominant will to do it, then it is (in the primary sense of the word) a 'necessary' consequence that we do it. And whoever *knows* that we have this power and this will, knows that we shall do so. This knowledge implies necessity in one sense, but not in the other; it implies the connexion between the cause and the effect—between our power

his conduct or judge of his actions by the standard of duty.[1] All just ground of punishment even in this life would be gone, for the culprit might justly urge that he was impelled to this course of action, however injurious to another or to the community, by the force of circumstances over which he could exercise no control. It is true that he might be unaware of any such impelling or constraining influence, but this would not alter the fact that they were present as operating forces.

That all men act, speak, and think as if the will were free is admitted on all sides, and it is clear that to think otherwise would deprive us of all motives to action and all sense of right and wrong. It is only because men cannot conceive *how* due effect can be given to God's grace, and man's will be regarded as free at the same time that they call upon others to surrender their consciousness and their moral principles.

One author has well stated in fitting language the controversy between Providence and Freewill. "A universal providence disposing all events without exception leaves no room for freedom. But there is such a providence, therefore no freedom; or, on the other side, there is a freedom of the will, therefore no such providence. Thus both parties lay down the same major, without which they would make no scruple to admit the minor assumed by their antagonists. But the most sober and considerate part of mankind, induced by the strong evidences both of freedom and providence, have forborne to pronounce them incompatible, *the only obstacle against the reception* of either, yet look upon their *consistency* as one of those mysteries which we are forced to admit though we cannot explain.[2]

united with will, and a certain action; but not any compulsion and opposition to our will. But if it be *impossible* to me to act otherwise than I do, which it is, if God foreknows my action, how can I be 'free?' This is but the very same fallacy, in another form of expression: for 'impossible' and 'necessary' correspond throughout all their senses, and are constantly opposed; and as 'necessary' is sometimes employed to denote compulsion to do any thing, so is 'impossible,' to denote *restraint* or *absence of power* to do it; which last indeed seems to be the original meaning of impossible. But 'impossible' is also often used so as to correspond with another sense of the word 'necessary,' to imply merely the absence of all room for *doubt*, or (as we often express it) of all 'chance' and 'contingency.' For instance, we say, 'such an one, since he possesses the utmost courage, will necessarily stand to his post'; or it is 'impossible he should fly'; not meaning that he is under any *restraint*; so far from it, the very ground of our pronouncing it impossible for him to fly, is our knowledge that it depends on him to do which he pleases, and our knowledge at the same time from his character, that he has no such inclination. If then this be all that is meant when one speaks of the 'impossibility' of a man's acting otherwise than he does, it is plain that it does not at all infringe on liberty; since it is evidently possible in the *other* sense, for instance, for the brave man to run away; that is he has the *power* to do so, and may *if he chooses*; according to this sense of the word, therefore, we admit the position, but deny the inference. But if on the other hand it be meant that the divine prescience implies impossibility in the other sense, that is, implies that it is not in our *power* in any case to do either this or that, according to our choice, the answer is to deny the position; which rests, in fact, on the fallacy of ambiguity, and which contradicts the evidence of each man's consciousness."

[1] See the argument of Cyril of Alex. contra Julian, lib. iv. and viii.; and St. Bern., de Grat. et lib. Arb.; and Hilary in Ps. cxix.; St. Basil in Hex. Hom. vi. § 7; Hom. in Ps. lxi. end of § 4.

[2] Tucker's Light of Nature, vol. iv. c. 25.

The exact mode in which the will of man is acted upon we are not of course, in our present condition, in a position to show; all we can safely assert is that the grace of God is marvellously preventing, wondrously assisting. As the wheel of the watermill is set and kept going by the continual flow of water, so man's will is set and kept going in the right direction by the perpetual stream of God's grace. And this grace never so operates as to set aside man's will, understanding, reason, or affections—it works so as to regulate these, moderate or lift them up, but it always preserves those powers and faculties which belong to him as a reasonable and responsible creature.

The fact is that the fear of attributing glory to man in his own salvation and of detracting from the glory of God lies at the root of the evil of the doctrine of moral necessity and the denial of the freedom of the human will. But a man whose life is saved by the kindness of another never supposes that his mere consent to be saved detracts from the kindness or glory of the other, or takes its place as the meritorious cause of his being saved. If, for instance, a man has fallen into the sea and is in danger of being drowned, when a rope is thrown to him, surely he could not claim to have been his own deliverer simply because he laid hold of the rope and thus enabled his deliverer to pull him out of the water. Had no one thrown him the rope he would have perished; his consent and willingness to take hold of it had it been thrown to him could not have saved him had there been no deliverer near to cast him the rope. So the cord of love let down to us and the power to take hold of it are the free grace given to us in Christ Jesus; but faith is necessary to take hold of the deliverance offered, and this, though given by God, must be put forth in the exercise of our own freewill. He who is saved is saved by grace, not by his faith, nor his freewill—the latter is put forth only in the acceptance or rejection of the grace offered. "For by grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God."[1]

It is a mistake to think that a denial of freewill brings greater glory to God. The truth is that by denying to man the gift with which God has endowed him, we take away his accountability for his actions, we impeach the wisdom and goodness of God, we outrage His justice and deny Him the rule of a moral government. We, in short, withhold from God the glory which He desires in man, and seek to force upon Him a glory of our own devising and for which He has no desire. Truth flatters neither God nor man, as, says Tertullian:[2] "It is not the part of a good and sound faith so to refer all things to God's will, and so to flatter everyone by saying, nothing can come to pass without God's permission, as that we should imagine ourselves to be able to do nothing." In all the

[1] Eph. ii. 8. [2] De Exhort. Castitat prop. Princip.

works of creation—in the heavens, in the seas, and in the earth—the Almighty receives a glory to His *power*: in the highest part of His creation He looks for more than glory merely to His *power*. He has bestowed upon man a freewill and made him a reasonable being, and He looks to him accordingly to render up to his God a higher glory—a glory to His *love*, a freewill offering, a glory which as a reasonable and responsible creature he could at least keep back, but which it should be his highest privilege and delight to render.

It must be admitted the subject is most mysterious. The reconciliation of the knowledge and ordination of God, and His gift of grace with the freedom of the human will is one of those theological puzzles which has perplexed the most subtle intellects this world has yet produced, and the result has ever been unsatisfactory. As we have before observed in considering the foreknowledge of God, we may be able to apprehend the truths as such and apart from each other, but how they dovetail with one another—how they harmonise—it may be impossible to define with precision. Our intellect carries us thus far and no further. Further indeed we may go, but then we proceed not by sight but solely by faith, waiting for the time when "that which is perfect is come" and "that which we know in part shall be done away." Let us, however, guard on the one hand against leaning too much on the side of freedom and thus drifting into Pelagianism, and on the other hand against taking too exaggerated a view of the place which God has allotted to grace and thus drifting into Manicheanism, Lutherism, or Jansenism. As the late Bishop of Brechin justly observes, "The Church of God has to hold the balance between the two. On the one hand, she seeks to develope to the highest degree the sense of individual responsibility, seeking to convince every soul of the unspeakable importance of the passing of each hour, making our eternity to depend on the good or evil use of time; on the other hand, she systematises the beautiful doctrine of grace; maintains that all that is great and of good report in man is the result of a condescendence on the part of God to the creation of His hands; that the beginning, middle, and end of man's salvation is influenced by God; and that there is a perpetual overflowing effluence from the Person of our Lord and from His Spirit, sanctifying, illuminating the soul of man, and aiding him in the search for truth, and in the operation of good. Thus it will be seen that in every good action there are two factors—a divine and a human. As is right, God's holy work goes first, suggesting, exciting, quickening; then follows man, freely yielding himself to the divine impulse. God offers freely and man accepts, and the double work becomes a unity. For His own good purposes, God respects human freedom. He does not force things. Man may resist grace, for the moral order of the world is founded in liberty."

(b) *Testimony of the Old Testament.*

The following passages are among the many showing that choice is placed before man as to whether he will do right or wrong; and involve the exercise of freewill. Nothing can be more explicit than the way in which the freedom of man's will and his power of choice is set before the chosen people as the very foundation of their relations with Him. Though they had been chosen—were indeed God's chosen people—yet the very last scene of Moses' life and ministry towards them was an exposition of the choice which lay before them and the awful responsibility of that choice.—Deut. xxx. 15—19.

When the Jews said to Moses, "Speak thou to us all that the Lord shall speak to thee, and we will hear it and do it,"[1] God answers, "They have well said all that they have spoken. Oh that there were such a heart in them that they would fear Me, and keep all My commandments always." Can anyone suppose that He who so earnestly desired they might have, and thus enquires who will give them this heart, should Himself withhold from them what was absolutely requisite that they might have it? "O that thou hadst hearkened to my commandments! then had thy peace been as a river, and thy righteousness as the waves of the sea."[2] "O that they were wise, that they understood this, that they would consider their latter end."[3] "Oh that my people had hearkened unto Me, and Israel had walked in My ways."[4] Is it possible to conceive these sentiments coming from One who had from all eternity decreed the denial of means sufficient to enable His people to do what they were thus wished to do? Yet Calvin says, referring to the reprobate: "He calls to them, but 'tis on purpose that they may be more deaf: He sets a light before them, that by that lustre they may be more blind. He lays down a doctrine that He may more confound and amaze them. Lastly, He applies a remedy, but with this intent that it may not heal them."[5]

Of course, Calvinists assert that expressions like those cited above do not refer to God's desire for the eternal salvation of His people, but have reference only to their temporal good and welfare. This, however, is a limitation unjustifiable, and is in reality making God desire that He may act unjustly! When beaten from this position, they try to explain away the force of the words in a different method. They say the words should be rendered so as to express not a wish or desire on God's part, but rather what

[1] Deut. v. 27—29.
[2] Isai. xlviii. 18.
[3] Deut. xxxii. 29.
[4] Psl. lxxxi. 13.
[5] Ecce vocem ad eos dirigit, sed ut magis obsurdescant; lucem accendit, sed ut reddantur cœciores; doctrinam profert, sed quâ magis obstupescant: remedium adhibet, sed ne saventur.—Just. lib. iii. cap. 24, § 13.

was to be desired by the Israelites themselves—"it should be wished for by them that such a heart would continue in them." This position is too weak to require refutation, and will dissolve with the force of its own ingenuity.

Gen. iii. 17.

Because . . . . thou hast eaten of the tree of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it, cursed is the ground for thy sake, in the sweat of thy face (*or* in toil) shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life.

The punishment was to come upon Adam and his offspring, not because of any absolute decree of God, but because of man's sin.

Gen. iv. 7.

If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? And if thou doest not well, sin lieth (*or* croucheth) at the door.

Sin only, observe, not the decree of reprobation, hinders his being accepted.

Deut. vii. 12.

It shall come to pass if (*or* because) ye hearken to these judgments, and keep, and do them, that the Lord thy God shall keep unto (*or* with) thee the covenant and the mercy which he sware unto thy fathers.

Deut. xi. 26, 27, 18.

Behold, I set before you this day a blessing and a curse: a blessing if you obey (*or* if ye shall hearken unto) the commandments of the Lord your God: and a curse if ye will not obey (*or* if ye shall not hearken). *See*, too, Deut. xxx. 15—19.

Deut. xxx. 19.

I call heaven and earth to record this day against you (*or* to witness against you this day) *that I have set before you* (*or* thee) *life and death*, (the) *blessing and cursing* (*or* the curse): therefore choose life, *that both thou and thy seed may live* (*or* that thou mayest live, thou and thy seed).

If man had not a free will, but was constrained by God, or by any absolute decree of the Almighty to act in one way or the other, these words would amount to a solemn farce. Why were they counselled to choose life if this choice was not open to them? On these words Luther says:[1] "The words are imperative, they assert nothing but what ought to be done; for Moses does not say, thou hast a power of choosing, but choose, keep, do. He

[1] Verba adducta sunt imperativa: nihil dicunt, nisi quid fieri debeat; neque enim Moses dicit, eligendi habes vim, vel virtutem; sed elige, serva, fac. Præcepta facienda tradit, non autem describit hominis facultatem. De serv. arbitr. c. 97.

delivers precepts to do, but does not describe the power of man." This view is not, however, supported by the context. It is true the power of man is not directly described, there being no necessity for this, but to say choose when the choice cannot be exercised is unreasonable.

Deut. xxxii. 29.

O that they were wise, that they understood this: that they would consider their latter end.—See Deut. v. 29.

How could God—the God of sincerity and truth—earnestly wish and desire the welfare of man, and that they might have spiritual wisdom, if He had decreed never to grant it to them, and if they had no power to do what he desired them?

Jos. xxiv. 15.

If it seem evil unto you to serve the Lord, choose you this day whom ye will serve.

2 Sam. xxiv. 12.

Go and say (*or* speak) *unto David, Thus saith the Lord, I offer thee three things,* choose thee one of them, *that I may do it unto thee.*

1 Chron. xxviii. 9.

If thou seek Him *He will be found of thee;* but if thou forsake Him, *He will cast thee off for ever.*

2 Chron. xv. 2.

The Lord is with you, while ye be with Him, and if ye seek Him *He will be found of you; but* if ye forsake Him *He will forsake you.*

Even Augustine admits that these two last passages show that the will is free.[1]

Psl. lxxxi. 13, 14.

O that my people had hearkened (*or* would hearken) *unto Me, and Israel had* (*or* that Israel would walk) *in My ways, I should soon have subdued* (*or* soon subdue) *their enemies and turned* (*or* turn) *My hand against their adversaries.* (See Deut. v. 29.)

Prov. i. 24, 25, 26.)

Because I have called and ye refused: I have stretched out My

[1] De Gratia et libero Arbitrio, cap. xi.

hand and no man regarded; but ye have set at nought all My counsel, and would none of My reproof. I also will laugh at (*or* in the day of) *your calamity; I will mock when your fear cometh.*

Isai. i. 16, 19, 20.

Wash you, *make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes: cease to do evil.* . . . If ye be willing and obedient *ye shall eat the good of the land; but if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword, for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it.*

Isai. v. 4.

What could have been done more to My vineyard that I have not done in it? Wherefore, when I looked that it should bring forth grapes, brought it forth wild grapes?

This passage shows that God gives sufficient grace for the doing of His will. It shows also that men are not operated upon by an irresistible power.

Isai. lvi. 4.

Thus saith the Lord unto (*or* of) *the eunuchs that keep My sabbaths* and choose the things that please Me, *and take hold of* (*or* and hold fast by) *My covenant.* (See Isai. lxv. 2.)

Isai. lxvi. 4.

I also will choose their delusions and will bring their fears upon them, because when I called none did answer; when I spake, they did not hear; but they did evil before (*or* they did that which was evil in) *Mine eyes,* and chose that in which (*or* wherein) I delighted not.

Jer. xviii. 7—10.

At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up, and *to pull* (*or* break) *down, and to destroy it;* if that nation against whom I have pronounced (*or* concerning which I have spoken) turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them. *And at what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom to build and to plant it;* if it do evil in My sight, that it obey not My voice, then I will repent of the good, wherewith I said I would benefit them.

Micah vi. 8.

What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?

Zech. i. 3.

Turn ye (*or* return) unto Me, saith the Lord of Hosts, and I will turn (*or* return) unto you, saith the Lord of Hosts.

(c) *Testimony of the New Testament.*

The following are among the many passages which assert or imply the freedom of the human will. They show that our free-will is subordinately a worker with God's free grace in such matters as are built upon His foundation—in fact in all save redemption and regeneration. The atonement was the act of our blessed Lord alone; the new birth, the operation of the Holy Spirit alone. Our freewill has nothing to do with either, except so far as where we may not have received Christian baptism in infancy, we submit to the rite in riper years. Conversion on the other hand, though itself effected by the operation of the Holy Spirit, is not usually irrespective of man's will. Hence it is enjoined on us as our duty, and we are exhorted to it with promises and threatenings.[1] So it is shown to be a matter of choice in some parts of Scripture.[2] It is shown likewise that the duty may be neglected of turning to God,[3] and that He requires our endeavours.[4] In many places He complains of man's perversity in obstructing His work of grace,[5] and threatens to withdraw His grace from men for their stubbornness and rebellion.[6]

Unless man has the power to turn to God when He calls—that is to exercise his will freely when invited—he is not a responsible creature, and the Scriptures are inexplicable. The invitation of the Gospel is to all—Christ died for all—and He says Himself, "Let him that thirsteth come unto the Fountain and drink."

Is it not clear that when our Saviour wept over Jerusalem and said, "Happy hadst thou been if thou hadst known in this thy day the things belonging to thy peace," that He implies that He sorrowed for their shortcomings and that they might have known the things belonging to their peace? Either His assertion that they might have been happy would have been contrary to truth, or His grief that they had not known the things belonging to their peace must have been grief on account of the decree of His Father—both of which are obviously absurd.

[1] Turn ye, Turn ye. Prov. i. 22; Ezek. xviii. 30, 32; Jer. vii. 3.
[2] Deut. xxx. 19; Isa. i. 19, 20; Jer. ~~xxiv. 15~~; see 2 Cor. v. 20.
[3] Psl. xcv. 7, 8; Jer. xxxvi. 6, 7; 2 Cor. vi. 1; Heb. ii. 3; iii. 7, 8.
[4] Psl. xxv. 9, 12, 14; Luke xvi. 14; John v. 44; vii. 3, 5, 52; Acts ii. 41; xiii. 45; Rom. i. 16; vi. 17; 2 Cor. iii. 15; Eph. iii. 17; 1 Thess. ii. 13; Rev. iii. 20.
[5] Isai. v. 4; lxiii. 7, 10; Ezek. xii. 2; Zech. vii. 10, 12; Mark iii. 15; vi. 6.
[6] Therefore the kingdom of God shall be taken from you, Matt. xxi. 41, 43; or else I will remove thy candlestick out of its place, Rev. ii. 5. None of these men who were bidden shall taste of my supper, Luke xiv. 24. See further, Luke xiii. 34, xix. 42; 1 Chron. xxviii. 9; 2 Chron. xv. 2; Prov. i. 24; Zech. ix. 15, 17; Matt. xiii. 12—15; Acts xxviii. 26; Rom. i. 18—21, 24, 25, 28; 2 Thess. ii. 10, 12; 1 Pet. ii. 7, 8; James iv. 6.

Luke x. 42.

Μαρία τὴν ἀγαθὴν μερίδα ἐξελέξατο, ἥτις οὐκ ἀφαιρεθήσεται ἀπ' αὐτῆς.

Mary chose *the good part, which shall not be taken away from her.*

If the discrimination of Mary were the exclusive effect of irresistible grace, our Saviour could hardly, with justice, have commended her as He did; and Martha might well have pleaded the want of ability as her excuse.

John iii. 19.

αὕτη δέ ἐστιν ἡ κρίσις, ὅτι τὸ φῶς ἐλήλυθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, καὶ ἠγάπησαν οἱ ἄνθρωποι μᾶλλον τὸ σκότος ἢ τὸ φῶς· ἦν γὰρ πονηρὰ αὐτῶν τα ἔργα.

And this is the condemnation, that the light is come into the world, and men loved the darkness rather than the light, because their deeds were evil.

Why was this written if men did not exert their wills in resisting a light which would otherwise have been effectual for their salvation? And why did our Lord express His admiration at the faith of some, as well as His surprise at the unbelief of others, if faith and unbelief were wrought irresistibly, and the unhappy sitters in darkness had no power of enjoying the light?

John v. 40.

οὐ θέλετε ἐλθεῖν πρός με, ἵνα ζωὴν ἔχητε.

Ye will not come to Me, that ye may have life.

If this does not imply that those spoken of might have come but for their own will, then words have lost their meaning. Indeed the οὐ θέλετε sets forth most strikingly the freedom of the will on which the unbeliever's condemnation rests.

John vi. 44.

οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐλθεῖν πρός με, ἐὰν μὴ ὁ πατὴρ ὁ πέμψας με ἑλκύσῃ αὐτόν.

No man can come to me except the Father which sent Me draw him.

Some regard this as a distinct statement of the doctrine that some men are absolutely and involuntarily led to Christ, and through Him to everlasting life, whilst others are not so led, and therefore fail of that life; but the whole context shows that all our Lord is teaching is that God the Father is co-operating with the work of the Son. Their work is in perfect concord and harmony; the former teaching all men and so leading them to the Son, and only those who yield to the Father's teaching and to this leading are in deed and actually led, and they only come to and believe in the Son. To suppose with some that in the text is to be found the cause why the sons to whom our Lord was speaking came not to Him, is to find in our Lord's words an

excuse rather than what is obviously their drift, an accusation of them. For if they had been unable to come to Christ unless they were drawn by the Father, and the Father drew them not, they would seem to be free from fault in not coming. On the contrary, it is clear their perverse will is accused in that they did not suffer themselves to be drawn by the Father nor believe in Him.

In the 12th chapter verse 32 of the same Gospel we meet again with the word "draw." "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will *draw* all men unto Me." This verse and the text we are considering are expressive of the same idea from two different aspects. It would be absurd to imagine that the Son draws all men, and the Father only a few, and leaves the rest. The two different aspects are the divine and the human: from the divine view all men are drawn, from the human view only a portion, because some resist the divine influence to which others yield. In other words, God draws all men, but all men are not drawn.

John vii. 17.

ἐάν τις θέλῃ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ποιεῖν, γνώσεται περὶ τῆς διδαχῆς, πότερον ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστιν, ἢ ἐγὼ ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ λαλῶ.

If any man willeth to do His will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God or whether I speak of Myself.

That is, if any man be willing to do *ἐάν τις θέλῃ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ποιεῖν.* On this Dean Alford says, "The *θέλειν*" should not have been slurred over in the English (authorised) version, for it is important. If any man's will be to do His will, &c. As it now stands in the English (authorised) version, a wrong idea is conveyed that the bare performance of God's outward commands will give a man sufficient acquaintance with Christian doctrine: whereas, what our Lord asserts to the Jews is, that if the *will* be set in His ways, if a man be really anxious to do the will of God, and thus to fulfil this first great commandment of the law—be, as Meyer expresses it, in ethical harmony with God—the singleness of purpose and subjection to the will of God will lead him on to faith in the promised and then apparent Messiah, and to a just discrimination of the divine character of His teaching."[1]

Acts vii. 51.

ὑμεῖς ἀεὶ τῷ Πνεύματι τῷ Ἁγίῳ ἀντιπίπτετε· ὡς οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν, καὶ ὑμεῖς.

Ye do always resist the Holy Ghost: as your fathers did, so do ye.

Acts xiii. 46.

ἐπειδὴ ἀπωθεῖσθε αὐτόν, καὶ οὐκ ἀξίους κρίνετε ἑαυτοὺς τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς.

Seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of eternal life.

[1] Alford's Greek Test. vol. i. p. 775, Ed. 1880.

1 Cor. iii. 9.

Θεοῦ γάρ ἐσμεν συνεργοί.

For we are labourers together with God; or rather, It is of God that we are fellow-workers.

1 Cor. vii. 37.

ὃς δὲ ἕστηκεν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ ἑδραῖος μὴ ἔχων ἀνάγκην, ἐξουσίαν δὲ ἔχει περὶ τοῦ ἰδίου θελήματος, καὶ τοῦτο κέκρικεν ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ καρδίᾳ, τηρεῖν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ παρθένον, καλῶς ποιήσει.

But he that standeth steadfast in his heart, having no necessity, but hath power as concerning his own will, *and hath so decreed in his own heart to keep his own virgin, shall do well.*

Gal. vi. 7, 8.

μὴ πλανᾶσθε· Θεὸς οὐ μυκτηρίζεται· ὅ γὰρ ἐὰν σπείρῃ ἄνθρωπος, τοῦτο καὶ θερίσει. ὅτι ὁ σπείρων εἰς τὴν σάρκα ἑαυτοῦ ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς θερίσει φθοράν, ὁ δὲ σπείρων εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ Πνεύματος θερίσει ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

Be not deceived; God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to his own flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption: but he that soweth to the Spirit, shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting.

Phil. ii. 13.

Θεὸς γάρ ἐστιν ὁ ἐνεργῶν ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ τὸ θέλειν καὶ τὸ ἐνεργεῖν ὑπὲρ τῆς εὐδοκίας.

For it is God which worketh in you, both to will and to do for His good pleasure.

This verse must be read with the preceding verse: "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling, for it is God, &c." If they disobeyed the Apostolic injunction to "work out their own salvation with fear and trembling," could it for a moment be supposed that God would work in them both to will and to do what proved in conformity to His good pleasure? (*ὑπὲρ τῆς εὐδοκίας*)—such an exposition being manifestly concordant with the signification of *ὑπὲρ* when it governs a genitive case—where would there be room for fear and trembling if, whether man worked or not, God did all for him?

The Apostle does not say, God works immediately and irresistibly. He gives the ability, but does not do the actual work Himself; if He did, it would be His act not ours. It is true the prophet Isaiah acknowledges, according to our translation, that the Lord "hath wrought all our works for us," but in the original it is "in us." It cannot mean that God does immediately and irresistibly all our spiritual works, for then would it be, God believing, repenting, praying, and so forth. Whatever mystery there may be in the abstract question, how a being can be created

so as to act independently of the Creator, it is certain that our Lord thus regards us and that we ourselves feel that we are thus constituted. Our actions are our own and not God's. Whatever measure of independence is necessary to render our actions our own, God has given us. Dr. Womoch in his examination of Tilenus, referring to this subject, cites Servetus, who says, "the fire burns not, the sun shines not, bread nourishes not, but that God alone doth immediately all these things in His creatures without having given them such properties!" And he adds, "Then, sure, it were fitter for the preacher to direct his admonitions to God alone, that He would perform His undertaken work in men's heart by His omnipotency, unto which they may never find ability to make resistance. But the truth is, it standeth not with God's wisdom, neither doth He ever use to work upon the will of man after this manner."

The passage in question shows forcibly how God works in His people to will and to do for or according to His good pleasure—mark "for or according to His good pleasure"—giving no confirmation to the idea that God is the author of our sinful acts. He works to accomplish His good pleasure, but not in the minds of wicked men to will and do iniquity according to their good pleasure. The sin of the sinner is his own, and is that which God commanded not, nor purposed, nor came it into His mind to decree or effect it.

Still full force must be given to the Apostle's words, and the working of the Almighty must not be explained away as with Pelagius, "velle operatur suadendo et præmia promittendo"; it is a real and powerful working whereby we are mightily though not irresistibly assisted. Augustine holds well to the truth, saying, "It is not to be for a moment supposed because he said, "It is God that worketh in you both to will and to do of His own good pleasure, that he meant to do away with the liberty of the will. If this indeed had been his meaning, he would not have said just before, 'Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling.' The balance is well kept, for when they are requested 'to work,' their freewill comes into account; and when it is added 'with fear and trembling,' they are warned against boasting of their good deeds as if they were their own, by attributing to themselves the performance of anything good."[1] The θέλειν and ἐνεργεῖν are thus explained by Calvin: "Fatemur, nos a natura habere voluntatem: sed quoniam peccati corruptione mala est, tunc bona esse incipit, quum reformata est a Deo. Nec dicimus hominem quicquam boni facere, nisi volentem: sed tunc, quum voluntas regitur a Spiritu Dei. Ergo quod ad hanc partem spectat, videmus Deo integram laudem asseri, ac frivolum esse quod sophistæ docent, offerri nobis gratiam et quasi in medio poni, ut eam amplectemur si libeat. Nisi enim efficaciter ageret Deus in nobis,

[1] De Gratia et libero Arbitrio, cap. 21 [IX.].

non diceretur efficere bonam voluntatem. De secunda parte idem sentiendum. Deus, inquit, est (ὁ) ἐνεργῶν ἐνεργεῖν. Perducit igitur ad finem usque pios affectus, quos nobis inspiravit, ne sint irriti: sicut per Ezechielem (xi. 20) promittit: Faciam ut in præceptis meis ambulent. Unde colligimus, perseverantiam quoque merum esse ejus donum."

1 Tim. iv. 16.

ἔπεχε σεαυτῷ καὶ τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ, ἐπίμενε αὐτοῖς· τοῦτο γὰρ ποιῶν καὶ σεαυτὸν σώσεις καὶ τοὺς ἀκούοντάς σου.

Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them; for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee.

2 Tim. ii. 21.

ἐὰν οὖν τις ἐκκαθάρῃ ἑαυτὸν ἀπὸ τούτων, ἔσται σκεῦος εἰς τιμήν, ἡγιασμένον, εὔχρηστον τῷ δεσπότῃ, εἰς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἡτοιμασμένον.

If a man therefore purge himself from these, he shall be a vessel unto honour, sanctified, meet for the master's use, prepared unto every good work.

2 Tim. iv. 7.

τὸν αγῶνα τὸν καλὸν ἠγώνισμαι, τὸν δρόμον τετέλεκα, τὴν πίστιν τετήρηκα.

I have fought the good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith.

Philemon. 14.

χωρὶς δὲ τῆς σῆς γνώμης οὐδὲν ἠθέλησα ποιῆσαι, ἵνα μὴ ὡς κατὰ ἀνάγκην τὸ ἀγαθόν σου ᾖ ἀλλὰ κατὰ ἑκούσιον.

But without thy mind would I do nothing; that thy goodness should not be as it were of necessity, but of freewill.

On this St. Jerome remarks, "That question which is repeated again and again by very many people, why God in making man, did not make him good and upright, may be solved by this passage. For if God be good voluntarily, and not of necessity, He ought, in making man, to make him after His own image and likeness, that is, so that he too might be good voluntarily, and not of necessity. For they who assert that man ought so to have been formed, that he could not have admitted of wickedness, say that he ought to have been made such, as to be good of necessity, and not by will. But if he had been made such as to do good not by will, but by necessity, he would not have been like God, who is therefore good because he wills it, not because He is forced. From which it is evident, that they require a thing which contradicts itself. For when they say, man ought to be made like God, they desire that man should have freewill as God has. But when they say he ought to be made such, that he could not admit of wickedness, while they impose on him the necessity of good, they desire that he should not be like God. Therefore the Apostle Paul also might have retained Onesimus, to minister unto him, without the

will of Philemon. But if he had done this without the will of Philemon, it would have been good, but not voluntary. But because it would not have been voluntary, it was in another way proved not to be good: for nothing can be called good, except what is voluntary. Whence the prudence of the Apostle is to be considered, who therefore sends back a fugitive slave to his master, that he may be of service to his master; who could not be of service, if he were detained from his master. Thus the former question is thus solved; God might make man good without his will: moreover, if he had done this, the good would not have been voluntary, but of necessity. But what is good from necessity, is not good; and in another respect is proved to be bad. Therefore leaving us to our own freewill, He rather made us after His own image and likeness; but to be like God, is absolutely good."[1]

James iv. 8.

ἐγγίσατε τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ ἐγγιεῖ ὑμῖν.
Draw nigh to God, and He will draw nigh to you.

1 Peter v. 6.

ταπεινώθητε οὖν ὑπὸ τὴν κραταιὰν χεῖρα τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα ὑμᾶς ὑψώσῃ ἐν καιρῷ.
Humble yourselves therefore under the mighty hand of God, that He may exalt you in due time. And see James iv. 10.

Rev. xix. 7.

ὅτι ἦλθεν ὁ γάμος τοῦ ἀρνίου, καὶ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ ἡτοίμασεν ἑαυτήν.
For the marriage of the Lamb is come, and His wife hath made herself ready.

(*d*) *Testimony of the Early Church.*

All the Fathers are unanimous on the freedom of the human will, and this is admitted by Calvin himself who says[2] "The Latin fathers have always retained the word "freewill" as if man stood yet upright. As for the Greek fathers, they have not been ashamed to make use of a much more arrogant expression calling man αὐτεξούσιος, 'free agent or self-manager,' just as if man had a power to govern himself.

Justin Martyr.

That man does what is right and what is wrong by his own free choice we thus prove, we see the same person passing from

[1] Jerome, vol. iv. pt. 1 p. 450.

[2] Quasi adhuc integer staret homo, semper apud Latinos liberi arbitrii nomen extitit. Græcos vero non pudicit multò arrogantius usurpare vocabulum; si quidem αὐτεξούσιον, dixerunt, acsi potestas sui ipsius penes hominem fuisset. Inst. lib. ii. cap. ii. § 4.

one thing to that which is contrary to it; but if it were fated that he should be either bad or good he would not be capable of doing contrary things or so often change; but neither would some be good and others bad since we should so declare fate to be the cause of evil, and to act contrary to itself. Or that which was before mentioned would appear to be true that neither virtue nor vice is in reality anything, but is only imagined to be good or bad; which in truth is the highest impiety and injustice.[1]

Inasmuch as He (God) knew it to be good, He created both angels and men, with the power of determining themselves to rectitude of action, and He appointed times so long as He deemed it good that they should possess this power of self-determination. And because He deemed it good, He executed His judgments both general and particular, self-determination being nevertheless preserved.[2]

Irenæus.

Man being endowed with reason and in this respect like to God, is made free in his will, and with power over himself, is himself the cause to himself that sometimes he becomes wheat, and sometimes chaff, therefore will he be justly condemned, because having been created with the faculty of reason he lost the true rationality, and living irrationally, opposed the righteousness of God.[3]

God made man free from the beginning, possessing his own power [of self-determination] even as he does his own soul, to obey the behests of God voluntarily, and not by compulsion of God. For force is not used by God, but a goodwill [towards us] is present with Him continually. And on this account He gives good counsel to all. For He has placed the power of choice in man as also in angels . . . . God therefore has given that which is good . . . . and they who work it shall obtain glory and honour because they worked good when they had it in their power not to work it. And they who do not work it shall receive the just judgment of God, because they have not worked good when they had it in their power to work it.[4]

[1] Ὅτι ἐλευθέρα προαιρέσει καὶ κατορθοῖ καὶ σφάλλεται, οὕτως ἀποδείκνυμεν. Τὸν αὐτὸν ἄνθρωπον τῶν ἐναντίων τὴν μετέλευσιν ποιοῦμενον ὁρῶμεν. Εἰ δὲ εἵμαρτο ἢ φαῦλον ἢ σπουδαῖον εἶναι, οὐκ ἄν ποτε τῶν ἐναντίων δεκτικὸς ἦν, καὶ πλειστάκις μετετίθετο· ἀλλ' οὐδ' οἱ μὲν ἦσαν σπουδαῖοι, οἱ δὲ φαῦλοι, ἐπεὶ τὴν εἱμαρμένην αἰτίαν φαύλων καὶ ἐναντία ἑαυτῇ πράττουσαν ἀποφαινόμεθα· ἢ ἐκεῖνο τὸ προειρημένον δόξει ἀληθὲς εἶναι, ὅτι οὐδὲν ἐστιν ἀρετὴ οὐδὲ κακία, ἀλλὰ δόξῃ μόνον ἢ ἀγαθὰ ἢ κακὰ νομίζεται· ἥπερ, ὡς δείκνυσιν ὁ ἀληθὴς λόγος, μεγίστη ἀσέβεια καὶ ἀδικία ἐστὶν. Just. Apol. i.

[2] Ἀλλ', ὡς ἐγίνωσκε καλὸν εἶναι γενέσθαι, ἐποίησεν αὐτεξουσίους πρὸς δικαιοπραξίαν καὶ ἀγγέλους καὶ ἀνθρώπους· καὶ χρόνους ὥρισε μέχρις οὗ ἐγίνωσκε καλὸν εἶναι τὸ αὐτεξούσιον ἔχειν αὐτοὺς· καὶ, ὅτι καλὸν εἶναι ὁμοίως ἐγνώριζε, καὶ καθολικὰς καὶ μερικὰς κρίσεις ἐποίει, πεφυλαγμένου μέντοι τοῦ αὐτεξουσίου. Just. Dial. cum Tryph.

[3] Homo vero rationabilis, et secundum hoc similis Deo, liber in arbitrio factus est et suæ potestatis ipse sibi causa est, ut aliquando quidem frumentum, aliquando autem palea fiat. Quapropter et justè condemnabitur, quoniam, rationabilis factus amisit veram rationem; et irrationabiliter vivens, adversatus est justitiæ Dei. Iren. adv. hær. lib. iv. c. 9.

[4] Liberum eum Deus fecit ab initio, habentem suam potestatem sicut et suam ani-

But since all men are of the same nature, and able to lay hold of and to do that which is good, and able to reject it again, and not to do it, some justly receive praise even from men of intelligence, and much more from God, and obtain deserved testimony of generally choosing and persevering in that which is good, while others are blamed and receive the deserved reproach of rejecting that which is just and good. . . . Not merely in works but also in faith has God preserved the will of man free and in his own power.[1]

Clement of Alexandria.

Neither praise nor dispraise, rewards or punishments, would be just if the soul had not the power of choosing and rejecting, and if evil were involuntary.[2]

Nor shall he who is saved be saved against his will, for he is not inanimate; but he will above all voluntarily and of free choice speed to salvation. Wherefore also man received the commandments in order that he might be self-impelled to whatever he wished of things to be chosen and to be avoided. Wherefore God does not do good by necessity, but from His free choice benefits those who spontaneously turn.[3]

Tertullian.

But no reward of good or evil would be justly bestowed upon him who had been found good or bad by necessity and not by will.[4]

I find that man was constituted by God free both in his own

mam, ad utendum sententia Dei voluntariè, et non coactum a Deo. Vis enim a Dei non fit: sed bona sententia adest illi semper. Et, propter hoc, consilium quidem bonum dat omnibus. Posuit enim in homine potestatem electionis, quemadmodum in angelis. . . . . Dedit ergo Deus bonum . . . . et qui operantur quidem illud, gloriam et honorem percipient, quoniam operati sunt bonum, cum possent non operari illud. Hi autem qui illud non operantur, judicium justum recipient Dei quoniam non sunt operati bonum cum possent operari illud. Iren. adv. hær. lib. iv. c. 71.

[1] Quoniam omnes ejusdem sunt naturæ, et potentes retinere, et operari bonum, et potentes rursum amittere id, et non facere; justè etiam apud homines sensatos, quanto magis apud Deum, alii quidem laudantur, et dignum percipiunt testimonium electionis bonæ, et perseverantiæ; alii vero accusantur, et dignum percipiunt damnum, eo quod justum et bonum reprobaverunt. . . . . Non tantum in operibus, sed etiam in fide liberum, et suæ potestatis arbitrium homini servavit Dominus. *Ibid.* lib. iv. c. 72. This is what Augustine says: Posse credere est omnium, credere vero fidelium. To have a power to believe is the prerogative of all men, but actually to believe is the prerogative of the faithful.

[2] Οὔτε δὲ οἱ ἔπαινοι, οὔτε οἱ ψόγοι, οὔθ' αἱ τιμαί, οὔθ' αἱ κολάσεις δίκαιαι, μὴ τῆς ψυχῆς ἐχούσης τὴν ἐξουσίαν τῆς ὁρμῆς καὶ ἀφορμῆς, ἀλλ' ἀκουσίου τῆς κακίας οὔσης. Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. i. cap. 17.

[3] Οὐτὲ μὴν ἄκων σωθήσεται ὁ σωζόμενος· οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἄψυχος· ἀλλὰ παντὸς μᾶλλον ἑκουσίως καὶ προαιρετικῶς σπεύσει πρὸς σωτηρίαν· διὸ καὶ τὰς ἐντολὰς ἔλαβεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος, ὡς ἂν ἐξ αὐτοῦ ὁρμητικὸς πρὸς ὁπότερον ἂν καὶ βούλοιτο τῶν τε αἱρετῶν καὶ τῶν φευκτῶν· οὔκουν ὁ Θεὸς ἀνάγκῃ ἀγαθοποιεῖ· κατὰ προαίρεσιν δὲ εὐποιεῖ τοὺς ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐπιστρέφοντας. Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. vii. cap. 7.

[4] Cæterum nec boni nec mali merces jure pensaretur ei, qui aut bonus aut malus necessitate fuit inventus, non voluntate. Tert., *Contra Marc.*, lib. ii. cap. 6. Similar to this is the saying of St. Bernard: "It is only a will free from compulsion and necessity which makes a creature capable of reward and punishment." *Lib. de gra. et lib. arb.* See too Epiphanius, lib. i. adv. hæres.

will and his own power, perceiving in him no image and likeness to God more than the form of his stature; for neither in face and bodily lines, which are so various in the human race was he made in uniformity to God, but he was marked with His image in that substance which he derived from God Himself, that is of the soul answering to the form of God, and in the freedom and power of his will.[1]

ORIGEN.

This also is settled in the doctrine of the Church, that every rational soul has freewill and volition, and that it has to contend against the devil and his angels, and opposing influences, because they strive to burden it with sins; but if we live rightly and wisely, we should endeavour to shake ourselves free of a burden of this kind. From which it follows, also, that we understand ourselves not to be subject to necessity, so as to be compelled by all means, even against our will to do either evil or good.[2]

I am of opinion that God so dispenses all rational souls that he may have respect to their eternal life; for they always have freewill, and of their own accord either are in better things and ascend until they come to the summit of virtue, or through negligence descend by various means to this or that degree of wickedness.[3]

CYPRIAN.

This has been heretofore, and still is, the grand source of heresy, while men of perverse minds have no regard to peace, are false to their trust, and no lovers of unity. These are things which the Lord permits and suffers, freedom of choice meantime remaining.[4]

Yet did not He upbraid them when they were leaving Him, or give out any severe menaces against them, but only turning to His apostles asked them: "Will ye also go away"? Therein preserving the law inviolate, whereby man is left to his liberty of choosing for himself either death or salvation.[5]

[1] Liberum et sui arbitrii et suæ potestatis invenio hominem à Deo institutum, nullam magis imaginem et similitudinem Dei in illo animadvertens, quam ejusmodi status formam. Neque enim facie et corporalibus lineis, tam variis in genere humano, ad uniformem Deum expressus est; sed in ea substantia, quam ab ipso Deo traxit, id est animæ, ad formam Dei respondentis, et arbitrii sui libertate et potestate signatus est. Tert. adv. Marc. lib. ii. cap. v. Reg. ed. p. 384.

[2] Est et illud definitum in ecclesiastica prædicatione, omnem animam rationabilem esse liberi arbitrii et voluntatis: esse quoque ei certamen adversus diabolum et angelos ejus, contrariasque virtutes, ex eo quod illi peccatis eam onerare contendant, nos vero si recte consulteque vivamus, ab hujusmodi onere nos exuere conemur. Unde et consequens est intelligere, non nos necessitati esse subjectos, ut omni modo etiam si nolimus vel mala vel bona agere cogamur. Origen, De Principiis, lib. i. Pref. vol. i. p. 48.

[3] Arbitror Deum singulas rationales animas ita dispensare, ut ad sempiternam eorum vitam respiciat: habent enim illæ semper liberum arbitrium, et sponte vel in melioribus sunt et ascendunt usquequo ad bonorum apicem pervenerint, vel ob negligentiam variis descendunt modis in tantum vel tantum malorum cumulum. *Ib.*, De Oratione xxix.

[4] Hinc hæreses et factæ sunt frequenter, et fiunt, dum perversa mens non habet pacem, dum perfidia discordans non tenet unitatem. Fieri vero hæc Dominus permittit et patitur, manente propriæ libertatis arbitrio. Cyprian de Unit. Eccles.

[5] Et tamen ille non increpuit recedentes, aut graviter comminatus est, sed magis conversus ad apostolos suos dixit: Num quid et vos vultis ire? servans scilicet legem, qua homo libertati suæ relictus, et in arbitrio proprio constitutus, sibimet ipse, vel mortem appetit, vel salutem. Cryp. Ep. lix.

Athanasius.

After the fall man's soul deeming pleasure to be good, abuses the very name of goodness by applying it to pleasure. Henceforth it no longer moves according to virtue or with any regard to God, but highly esteeming worthless things it abusively chooses them, inasmuch as it possesses the self-determination of Freewill. For, as it can incline to what is good, so likewise it can decline from what is good. Yet when it declines from what is good it does so through a free preference and a distinct estimation of the contrary.[1]

Ambrose.

We are not constrained to obedience by a servile necessity, *but by freewill*, whether we lean to virtue or are inclined to vice.[2]

God afforded to all the means of recovery, that whoever perish may impute his own destruction to himself, forasmuch as he would not be cured when he had a remedy whereby he could escape.[3]

You see, because the power of God everywhere co-operates with the endeavours of man, that nobody can build a house without the Lord, nobody can keep a city without the Lord, nobody can begin anything without the Lord.[4]

Jerome.

The more we enquire the more evident will our vanity be, and that words are superfluous, and that freewill is not taken away by the prescience of God, but that in every effect there are antecedent causes.[5]

Do not think that there are only good or only bad things in the world since the world consists of different things contrary to each other, hot and cold, dry and moist, hard and soft, dark and light, bad and good. But God has done this that wisdom may be displayed in choosing good and avoiding evil, and that freewill may be left to man.[6]

[1] Ἀποστᾶσα (ἡ ψυχὴ) . . . . καὶ ἰδοῦσα καλὸν ἑαυτῇ εἶναι τὴν ἡδονὴν, πλανηθεῖσα κατεχρήσατο τῷ τοῦ καλοῦ ὀνόματι, καὶ ἐνόμισεν εἶναι τὴν ἡδονὴν αὐτὸ τὸ ὄντως καλόν· ἐρασθεῖσα δὲ τῆς ἡδονῆς, ποικίλως αὐτὴν ἐνεργεῖν ἤρξατο. . . . Κινεῖται οὖν, οὐκ ἔστι μὲν κατὰ ἀρετὴν, οὐδὲ ὥστε τὸν Θεὸν ὁρᾶν· ἀλλὰ, τὰ μὴ ὄντα λογιζομένη, τὸ ἑαυτῆς δυνατὸν μεταποιεῖ, καταχρωμένη τουτῷ εἰς ἃς ἐπενόησεν ἐπιθυμίας· ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτεξούσιος γέγονε. Δύναται γὰρ, ὥσπερ πρὸς τὰ καλὰ νεύειν, οὕτω καὶ τὰ καλὰ ἀποστρέφεσθαι. Ἀποστρεφομένη δὲ τὸ καλὸν, πάντως τὰ ἐναντία λογίζεται. Athan. cont. Gent. Orat.

[2] Non servili ad obediendum constringimur necessitate, sed voluntate arbitrii, sive ad virtutem propendemus, sive ad culpam inclinamur. Ambrose, de Jacob et vita beata, lib. i. cap. i. § i.

[3] Ideo omnibus opera sanitatis detulit, ut quicunque periret mortis suæ causas sibi adscribat; qui curari noluit cum remedium haberet quo posset evadere. Amb., De Cain et Abel, lib. ii. cap. xiii.

[4] Vides itaque quia ubique Domini virtus studiis cooperatur humanis; ut nemo possit ædificare sine Domino, nemo custodire sine Domino, nemo quidquam incipere sine Domino. Amb., Expos. Evang. Sec. Luc., lib. ii. § 84.

[5] Quanto enim amplius quæsierimus, tanto magis ostendi vanitatem nostram, et verba superflua; et non ex præscientia Dei liberum tolli arbitrium, sed causas ante præcedere, quare unum quodque sic factum sit. Hier., Com. in Eccles. cap. vi.

[6] Nec putes vel bonorum tantum aut malorum in mundo esse naturam, quum ex diversis mundus iste contrariis subsistat, calidis et frigidis, siccis et humectis, duris et mollibus, tenebrosis et lucidis, malis et bonis. Hoc autem fecit Deus, ut habeat sapientia locum in eligendo bonum, et vitando malum; et liberum homini relinquatur arbitrium. Hier., in Eccles. cap. vii.

Man from the beginning of his creation, makes use of God as his helper; and seeing it is of His grace that he is created, and of His mercy that he subsists and lives, he can do no good work without Him; who so gave freewill that He might not deny His own grace in every work, lest the liberty of the will should redound to the injury of the Creator, and to the hardening of him who is so made free that without God he knows that he is nothing.[1]

God has endued us with freewill. We are not necessarily drawn either to virtue or to vice. For where necessity rules there is no room left [either for damnation, or] for the crown.[2]

Our will is kept free to turn either way that God may dispense His rewards and punishments not according to His own prejudice but according to the merits of every one.[3]

You speak evil of us without ground; *you tell the ignorant that we condemn freewill,* but let the man who condemns it be condemned.[4]

That we possess freewill and can turn it either to a good or bad purpose according to our determination is owing to His grace who made us after His own image and likeness.[5]

It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy (Rom. ix. 16). From which words we understand that to will and to run are our own, but that the completion of our will and running belongs to the mercy of God, and thus it happens that both in our will and running, freewill is preserved and in the consummation of our will and running all things are left to the power of God. . . . . *We so preserve freewill to man that we do not deny the assistance of God in each thing.*[6]

AUGUSTINE.

We place no man's nativity under the fatal power of the stars that we may free the liberty of the will, whereby our actions are

[1] Ita et homo a principio conditionis suæ Deo utitur adjutore; et quum illius sit gratiæ quod creatus est, illiusque miscricordiæ quod subsistit et vivit; nihil boni operis agere potest absque eo, qui ita concessit liberum arbitrium ut suam per singula opera gratiam non negaret; ne libertas arbitrii redundaret ad injuriam conditoris, et ad ejus contumaciam, qui ideo liber conditus est, ut absque Deo nihil esse se noverit. Hier., Epist. cxl. ad Cyprian. [Ep. cxxxix.]

[2] Liberi arbitrii nos condidit Deus; nec ad virtutes nec ad vitia necessitate trahimur. Alioquin ubi necessitas [est nec damnatio] nec corona est. Hier. adv. Jovin, lib. ii. The words in brackets are a false reading.

[3] Liberum servat arbitrium, ut in utramque partem, non ex præjudicio Dei, sed ex meritis singulorum, vel pœna vel præmium sit. *Ib.* Com. in Isa. Proph. lib. i. cap. i.

[4] Frustra blasphemas, et ignorantium auribus ingeris, nos liberum arbitrium condemnare. Damnetur ille qui damnat. *Ib.* ad Ctesiphon. adv. Pelag. cap. iv.

[5] Ut enim liberum possideamus arbitrium, et vel ad bonam vel ad malam partem declinemus propria voluntate, ejus est gratiæ, qui nos ad imaginem et ad similitudinem sui tales condidit. *Ib.* adv. Pelag. lib. i. cap. i.

[6] Non enim volentis, neque currentis, sed miserentis est Dei. Ex quibus intelligimus nostrum quidem esse velle et currere: set ut voluntas nostra compleatur et cursus, ad Dei misericordiam pertinere; atque ita fieri, ut et in voluntate nostra et in cursu, liberum servetur arbitrium; et in consummatione voluntatis et cursus, Dei cuncta potentiæ relinquantur . . . . qui sic liberum homini servamus arbitrium, ut Dei per singula adjutorium non negemus. Hier. adv. Pelag., lib. i. cap. ii.

rendered either moral or immoral, from every bond of necessity on account of the righteous judgment of God.[1]

The beginning of our salvation flows from the merciful God, but it is in our own power to consent to His saving inspiration.[2]

They that come (to Christ) ought not to impute it to themselves because they came being called; and they that would not come ought not to impute it to another, but only to themselves because when they were called *it was in the power of their freewill to come.*[3]

Do we then by grace make void man's freedom of will? God forbid! We rather establish that faculty. For as the law is not weakened but established by faith, neither is freewill by grace. Indeed, the law is only fulfilled by a free exercise of the will; for by the law is the knowledge of sin. By faith comes the acquisition of grace to resist sin; by grace the soul procures healing from the disease of sin; by the health of the soul liberty is given to the will, from this freedom of the will arises the love of righteousness, and from this love of holiness proceeds the accomplishment of the law. Accordingly, as the law is not made void, but is established through faith, since faith procures the grace whereby the law may be fulfilled, so the freedom of the will is not made void through grace, but rather is thereby established, inasmuch as grace gives a healthy condition to a man's will, whereby he is enabled to love righteousness frankly and fully.[4]

If he (Pelagius) will agree that the will itself and the action are assisted by God, and so assisted that we cannot will or do anything well without that assistance, if, too, he believes that this is that very grace of God through our Lord Jesus Christ which makes us righteous through His righteousness and not our own, so that our true righteousness is that which we have of Him, then no controversy will be left between us, as far as I can judge concerning the assistance we have from the grace of God.[5]

[1] Nos quidem sub fato stellarum nullius hominis genesim ponimus, ut liberum arbitrium voluntatis, quo vel bene vel male vivitur, propter justum judicium Dei ab omni necessitatis vinculo vindicemus. August. contr. Faust. lib. ii. cap. 5.

[2] Initium salutis nostræ a Deo miserante habemus; ut acquiescamus salutiferæ inspirationi, nostræ est potestatis. *Ib.* Dogmatibus Ecclesiasticis cap. xxi.

[3] Non illi debent sibi tribuere, qui venerunt, quia vocati venerunt; nec illi qui noluerunt venire, debuerunt alteri tribuere, sed tantum sibi; quia ut venirent vocati in liberâ erat voluntate. *Ib.* Quæstionum lib. lxxxiii. Quæst. 68. See also *Ib.* lib. de Quantitate Aminæ, cap. xxxvi; Epist. ad Hilar. clvii. cap. ii. §10.

[4] Liberum ergo arbitrium evacuamus per gratiam? Absit, sed magis liberum arbitrium statuimus. Sicut enim lex per fidem, sic liberum arbitrium per gratiam non evacuatur sed statuitur. Neque enim lex impletur nisi libero arbitrio, sed per legem cognitio peccati, per fidem impetratio gratiæ contra peccatum, per gratiam sanitas animæ a vitiis peccati, per animæ sanitatem libertas arbitrii, per liberum arbitrium justitiæ dilectio, per justitiæ dilectionem legis operatis. Ac per hoc, sicut lex non evacuatur, sed statuitur per fidem, quia fides impetrat gratiam, qua lex impleatur: ita liberum arbitrium non evacuatur per gratiam, sed statuitur, quia gratia sanat voluntatem, qua justitia libere diligatur. August., de Spiritu et Litera, § 52.

[5] Si, consenserit, etiam ipsam voluntatem et actionem divinitus adjuvari, et sic adjuvari, ut sine illo adjutorio nihil bene velimus et agamus, eamque esse gratiam Dei per Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum, in qua nos sua non nostra justitia justos facit, ut ea sit vera

He (God) has revealed to us by His holy scriptures that there is in man free will. But how He has revealed this I do not attempt to explain by human testimony, but by divine. There is to begin with the fact that God's precepts themselves would be of no use to a man unless he had freewill by which he might obtain the promised reward as he obeys the precepts.[1]

There is, however, always within us a freewill, but it is not always good; for it is either free from righteousness when it serves sin,—and then it is evil,—or else it is free from sin when it is the servant of righteousness,—and then it is good. But the grace of God is evermore good; and by its means it comes to pass that a man is under the influence of a good will, though he was previously possessed by an evil one. By the same grace it also comes to pass that the very good will which has now begun to be, is increased, and will become so great as to be able to fulfil whatever divine commandments it may wish, when it has once firmly and completely formed its desire. This is the purport of what the Scripture says: 'If thou wilt, thou shall keep the commandments;' so that the man who has the will, but not the power, discovers that he does not yet possess a perfect will, and prays that he may have it so perfected that it may be sufficient for keeping the commandments; and then, indeed, he receives assistance enough to perform what he is commanded. The will is then of use when we have the power; just as the power is also then of use when we have the will. For what does it profit us if we possess will without power, or else lack the will when we possess the power?[2]

For which of us can say that by the sin of the first man freewill perished from the human race? Through sin liberty indeed perished, but it was that liberty which was in Paradise, of having a full righteousness with immortality; on account of which loss human nature is without divine grace, since the Lord says, 'If the Son shall make you free, then shall ye be free indeed' (John viii. 36) —certainly free to live well and righteously. For freewill did

nostra justitia, quæ nobis ab illo est; nihil de adjutorio gratiæ Dei quantum arbitror, inter nos controversiæ relinquetur. *Ib.* cont. Pelag. et Cœlest. De gra. Chr. cap. xlvii. § 52.

[1] Revelavit autem nobis per scripturas suas sanctas, esse in homine liberum voluntatis arbitrium. Quomodo autem revelaverit, commemoro vos, non humano eloquio, sed divino. Primum, quia ipsa divina præcepta homini non prodessent nisi haberet liberum voluntatis arbitrium, quo ea faciens ad promissa præmia perveniret. *Ib.* De Gra. et lib. Arb. ad Valen., cap. ii.

[2] Semper est autem in nobis voluntas libera, sed non semper est bona. Aut enim a justitia libera est, quando servit peccato, et tunc est mala; aut a peccato libera est, quando servit justitiæ, et tunc est bona. Gratia vero Dei semper est bona, et per hanc fit ut sit homo bonæ voluntatis, qui prius fuit voluntatis malæ. Per hanc etiam fit, ut ipsa bona voluntas, quæ jam esse cœpit, augeatur; et tam magna fiet, ut possit implere divina mandata quæ voluerit, cum valde perfecteque voluerit. Ad hoc enim valet quod scriptum est: *Si volueris, conservabis mandata*; ut homo qui voluerit et non potuerit, nondum se plene velle cognoscat, et oret ut habeat tantam voluntatem, quanta sufficiat ad implenda mandata. Sic quippe adjuvatur ut faciat quod jubetur. Tunc enim utile est velle, cum possumus; et tunc utile est posse, cum volumus: nam quid prodest, si quod non possumus volumus, aut quod possumus nolumus? *De Gratia et libero arbitrio* cap. xxxi. [xv.]

not so far perish in the sinner, but that by it all sin,—especially they who sin with delight and with love of sin; they will what pleases them.[1]

But this will, which is free in evil because it takes pleasure in evil, is not free in good, for the reason that it has not been made free. Nor can a man will any good thing unless he is aided by Him who cannot will evil,—that is, by the grace of God through Jesus Christ our Lord.[2]

For who is drawn, if he was already willing? And yet no man comes unless he is willing. Therefore he is drawn in wondrous way to will, by Him who knows how to work within the very hearts of men—not that men who are unwilling should believe, which cannot be, but that they should be made willing from being unwilling.[3]

We do not say that by the sin of Adam freewill perished out of the nature of men, but that it is of force for sinning in men subjected to the devil; while it is not of avail for pious living, unless the will itself of man should be made free by God's grace, and assisted to every good movement of action, of speech, of thought.[4]

Chrysostom.

When you hear these things do not imagine that the calling carries with it necessity; for God does not compel, but leaves men masters of their freewill even after His call.[5]

Virtue and vice depend upon our own will after grace is given from above; if we be diligent we may become conspicuous for virtue; and on the other hand if we be negligent we fall into the abyss of sin. For this is the thing in which we differ from brute animals, that we are honoured with the gift of reason by the merciful God, and the knowledge of good and evil is implanted in our nature. Let no one then pretend that he neglects virtue from

[1] Quis autem nostrum dicat, quod primi hominis peccato perierit liberum arbitrium de humano genere? Libertas quidem periit per peccatum, sed illa quæ in paradiso fuit, habendi plenam cum immortalitate justitiam, propter quod natura humana divinâ indiget gratiâ, dicente Domino. Si vos Filius liberaverit, tunc vere liberi eritis; utique liberi ad bene justeque vivendum. Nam liberum arbitrium usque adeo in peccatore non periit, ut per illud peccent, maxime omnes qui cum delectatione peccant et amore peccati, hoc eis placet quod eis libet. *Ib. contra duas Epis. Pelag.*, lib. i. cap. v. [ii.]

[2] Sed hæc voluntas quæ libera est in malis, quia delectatur malis, ideo libera in bonis non est, quia liberata non est. Nec potest homo boni aliquid velle, nisi adjuvetur ab eo qui malum non potest velle hoc est, gratiâ Dei per Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum. *Ib.* cap. vii. [iii.]

[3] Quis trahitur si jam volebat? Et tamen nemo venit nisi velit. Trahitur ergo miris modis ut velit ab illo, qui novit intus in ipsis hominum cordibus operari, non ut homines quod fieri non potest, nolentes credant, sed ut volentes ex nolentibus fiant. *Ib.* cap. xxxvii. [xix.]

[4] Peccato Adæ arbitrium liberum de hominum natura periisse non dicimus; sed ad peccandum valere in hominibus subditis diabolo; ad bene autem pieque vivendum non valere, nisi ipsa voluntas hominis Dei gratiâ fuerit liberata, et ad omne bonum actionis, sermonis, cogitationis adjuta. *Ib.* lib. ii. cap. ix. [v.]

[5] Σὺ δὲ ἀκούων ταῦτα, μὴ ἀναγκαστὴν τὴν κλῆσιν εἶναι νόμιζε· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀναγκάζει ὁ Θεὸς, ἀλλ' ἀφίησι κυρίους εἶναι προαιρέσεων καὶ μετὰ τὴν κλῆσιν. Chrysos. de Laud. Paul. Hom. iv.

ignorance, or from his not having anyone to guide him in its path. For we have a sufficient teacher, conscience; and it is impossible that any should be deprived of its assistance.[1]

God is not accustomed to make man good by necessity or force, nor is His election of those who are called by violence but by persuasion. And that you may learn that the calling is not by force, consider how many of those who were called have been lost. Whence it is evident that our salvation or destruction depends upon our own wills.[2]

[1] ὅτι ἐν τῇ προαιρέσει κεῖται τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ, μετὰ τὴν ἄνωθεν χάριν, τὰ τῆς ἀρετῆς, καὶ τῆς κακίας· καὶ ὅτι καὶ σπουδάσαντες δυνάμεθα γενέσθαι ἐνάρετοι, καὶ ῥαθυμήσαντες πάλιν εἰς τὸν τῆς ἁμαρτίας κρημνὸν καταφερόμεθα; Τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν ᾧ τῶν ἀλόγων διεστήκαμεν, τὸ λόγῳ τετιμῆσθαι ἡμᾶς παρὰ τοῦ φιλανθρώπου Θεοῦ, καὶ ἐν τῇ φύσει τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ ἐναποκεῖσθαι τὴν γνῶσιν τοῦ καλοῦ, καὶ τοῦ πονηροῦ. Μηδεὶς τοίνυν προφασιζέσθω ὡς δι' ἄγνοιαν ἀρετῆς ἀμελῶν, ἢ διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν τὸν ὑποδεικνύντα τὴν ταύτης ὁδόν. Ἀρκοῦντα γὰρ ἔχομεν διδάσκαλον τὸ συνειδός, καὶ οὐχ οἷόν τέ τινα ἀπεστερῆσθαι τῆς ἐκεῖθεν βοηθείας. Chrysost. Gen. Hom. liv. Two passages from the Homilies on Matt., one from Hom. lxxx. § 3, and the other from Hom. lxxxii. § 4, have not been cited, as doubts have been entertained as to their genuineness.

[2] Οὐ γὰρ ἀνάγκῃ καὶ βίᾳ ποιεῖν ἀγαθοὺς εἴωθεν ὁ Θεὸς, οὐδὲ ἡ ἐκλογὴ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ αἵρεσις βιαστικὴ τῶν καλουμένων ἐστὶν, ἀλλὰ προτρεπτική. Καὶ ἵνα μάθῃς, ὅτι οὐ βιάζεται ἡ κλῆσις, σκόπει πόσους συνέβη τῶν κληθέντων ἀπολέσθαι. Ὅθεν φανερὸν, ὅτι καὶ ἐν τῇ γνώμῃ κεῖται τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ, τὸ σωθῆναι καὶ ἀπολέσθαι. Chrysost. *St. John, Hom.* xlvii. 4; and see also ¶ *Epist. Tim.* cap. iv., *Hom.* viii.

Chapter VI.

FINAL PERSEVERANCE.

(a) *Generally.*

There is no question that the Elect, so far as they are known to God—the ultimate Election according to His foreknowledge will finally persevere in faith and sanctification, for whosoever does not persevere by the self-same non-persevering is declared to be not among the number of this Election. For Election in this sense presupposes an infallible foreknowledge of final perseverance. But this is not the Election we are concerned with—we are considering the Election revealed in Holy Scripture—not some abstract election as it exists in the mind of God who seeing the end from the beginning knows that certain individuals will be those who through faith and patience inherit the promises.

The will of God undoubtedly is that all the Elect should continue faithful unto the end and attain everlasting life,[1] and for this purpose were they chosen. But that many frustrate the will and desire of God and fail to attain unto the kingdom of heaven we know very well.

So there is no question but that those who persevere unto the end are kept "by the power of God through faith."[2] It is clear, too, that those who do not wickedly depart from God can never be forced from Him by the power of the evil one, for none shall ever be able to pluck them out of His hands,"[3] not death itself; for "the gates of hades shall not prevail against them."[4] "God is faithful who will not suffer us to be tempted above that we are able, but will with the temptation make a way to escape that we may be able to bear it."[5] So that we may exclaim with the Apostle, "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ, shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? . . . I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height nor depth, nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."[6]

[1] 2 Pet. iii. 9; 1 Tim. ii. 4.
[2] 1 Pet. i. 5.
[3] John x. 29.
[4] Matt. xvi. 18.
[5] 1 Cor. x. 13.
[6] Rom. viii. 35, 38, 39.

It may also be granted that God has promised perseverance in the paths of righteousness to those who walk conscientiously according to the light given them, and they may rest with assurance upon His word that "He which hath begun a good work in them will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ;"[1] and that if they "cast not away their confidence, but patiently continue to do the will of God, they shall inherit the promises;"[2] but we shall nowhere find that God has absolutely promised to interpose His almighty power to prevent the fall of those who wilfully turn from Him, or that He has promised to influence irresistibly those who have been united to Christ in order that they may persevere in faith unto the end.

And this is the real question,—whether those who have been elected into the congregation of Christ's Church (for that is the only election we can properly consider) and have walked by faith for a time may finally fall away from grace.

The immediate and direct object of Election is not to eternal life itself, but that by entrance into the Universal Church, this may be ultimately the portion of the Elect. Their Election by baptism tells of God's blessed purpose and design that they should attain the crown that fadeth not away, but as their condition in this life is one of trial and probation, the possibility is left open to them of defeating the purpose and design of the Almighty, and of finally falling away to everlasting destruction.

This immediate object of Election is lost sight of in the Arminian and Calvinistic ideas of Election, for their ideality of Election is of certain individuals to eternal life *as the direct object*; and both schemes entirely ignore the true position of man in this life. The Apostles never taught the assured final perseverance of every individual among the Elect, and there is not a single passage in Holy Scripture which, read with its context, warrants such an idea. They invariably taught that the Elect might finally fall away and perish everlastingly.

Augustine considered that there are some who are called not according to God's purpose, while there are others called according to His purpose. The former are not elected, strictly speaking, being among those of whom it was said, "Many are called," not among those of whom it is said, "But few are chosen." And he considered that God has wisely ordained to mingle some who would not persevere with a certain number of His saints, so that those for whom security from temptation in this life is not desirable may not be secure.[3] Of those called but not chosen he says, "And yet who can deny that they are elected, since they believe and are baptised and live according to God? Manifestly they are called elect by those who are ignorant what they shall be, but not by Him who knew that they would not have the per-

[1] Phil. i. 6. [2] Heb. x. 35, 36. [3] De Dono Persev. cap. xix.

severance which leads the Elect forward into the blessed life, and knows that they will so stand, as He would have foreknown that they would fall."[1] And in another place he says, "It is He, therefore, who makes them to persevere in good, who makes them good. But they who fall and perish have never been in the number of the predestinated."[2]

He cites the case of two infants equally bound by original sin, one being taken and the other left; of two wicked men, one being so called as to follow and the other not, and of two pious men, why to the one should be given perseverance unto the end and to the other it should not be given, and assigns this to God's unsearchable judgment, asserting that in each case the one is predestinated, the other not. And citing 1 John ii. 19, he says, "What I ask, is the meaning of 'They were not of us: for if they had been of us, they would certainly have continued with us'? Were not both created by God—both born of Adam? Had not both been made from the earth, and received from Him who said, 'I have created all breath,'[3] souls of one and the same nature? Lastly, had not both been called, and followed Him that called them? And had not both become from wicked men, justified men, and both been renewed by means of the laver of regeneration? But if he were to hear this, who beyond all doubt knew what he was saying, he might answer and say, these things are true. In respect of all these things these were of us; nevertheless, in respect of a certain other distinction, these were not of us, for if they had been of us, they certainly would have continued with us. What then is this distinction? God's books lie open, let us not turn away our view: the divine Scripture cries aloud, let us give it a hearing. These were not of them, because they had not been called according to God's purpose; they had not been chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world; they had not gained a share in Him; they had not been predestinated according to His purpose, who worketh all things. For if they had been this, they would have been of them, and without doubt they would have continued with them."[4]

The learned bishop of Hippo's idea of the difference in call and the special gift of Perseverance is purely fanciful. It seems to have been raised with the idea of meeting the objection to which his scheme of Predestination was fairly open and of accounting for the non-perseverance of some of the baptised. Let us leave the narrow paths into which we are bound to follow if we accept such a scheme of predestination as that which receives the countenance of the great bishop of the early Church, in order to hold the palm of consistency, and look rather to the broader views which the vista of Holy Scripture lays open before us of the mercy,

[1] De Correptione et Gratia, cap. xvi.
[2] *Ib.* cap. xxxvii.
[3] Isa. lvii. 16 [see lxx.].
[4] De Dono Persev. cap. xxi.

goodness and wisdom of God. There we are instructed that the Holy Spirit strives with man that everything will be done short of his being fatally compelled to adopt a line of conduct against his will. That so long as there is the slightest chance of reform being effected, the all merciful Lord will strive with the rebellious. "Behold," says the voice of the Judge, "these three years I come seeking fruit on this fig tree, and find none, cut it down, why cumbereth it the ground?" And the pleading voice of the Intercessor is heard, "Lord, let it alone this year also, till I shall dig about it and dung it; and if it bear fruit well, and if not then *after that* thou shalt cut it down."[1] But judgment does go forth finally, for as our Lord Himself says, "I am the Vine, and My Father is the husbandman, every branch in Me that beareth not fruit, He taketh away."[2] "If a man abideth not in Me, *he is cast forth as a branch and is withered.*"[3]

God has shown His grace and love towards us, not only in giving His Son to die for us, but also by bringing us into His Church, and His purpose will most surely be fulfilled in the perfecting of His Saints. But whether *we* who are called and engrafted into Christ by baptism will be of that number who shall inherit the Kingdom, must depend on whether we are faithful to our call. It must depend on our continuance in the faith. If we abide in Him then shall we flourish like the palm tree, reaping eternal blessedness, but if we fail to conform our wills to the will of God, if we reject His fashioning work and permit Him not by His Holy Sacraments and ordinances to mould us for our place in the Living Temple He is erecting, then shall we be cast forth as useless stones and our places be occupied by others more worthy of His high and glorious calling.

One of our greatest Reformers,[4] has a fine admonition on the subject. "I will you to pray," says he, "that God will continue His Spirit in you. I do not put you in comfort, that if ye once have the Spirit, ye cannot lose it. There be new Spirits start up now of late which say, after we have received the Spirit, we cannot sin. I will make but one argument. St. Paul had brought the Galatians to the profession of the faith, and left them in that state; they had received the Spirit once, but they sinned again as he testified of them himself. He saith, ye did run well, ye were once in a right way; and again, ye did receive the Spirit, not by the works of the law, but by the righteousness of faith. Once they had the Spirit by faith; but false prophets came, when he was gone from them, and they fell from all that Paul had planted them in; and then said Paul, O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you? If this be true, we may lose the Spirit that we have once possessed. It is a fond thing, I will not tarry in it."

[1] Luke xiii. 7-9.
[2] John xv. 1, 2.
[3] John xv. 6.
[4] Latimer Ser. vol. i. 218.

If the operation of the Holy Ghost in man were such as to irresistibly compel him to a particular line of conduct or course of action, the doctrine of a Fatal Necessity would find a place in the Economy of God, and from a being endowed with Free Will, man would descend to a mere machine—all moral responsibility would be destroyed, and he could not be fairly open to reward or punishment, for no act of the creature which is necessitated, or which it could by no possibility avoid the doing of, can be rewardable, and yet our Lord says, "He that endureth to the end, the same shall be saved."[1]

It follows, therefore, first, that if the Elect are under the necessity of persevering unto the end without the possibility of falling away from grace, their final perseverance cannot be the subject of reward at the hands of the Almighty; and secondly, that as a reward is promised as the result of the final perseverance of the Elect, this final perseverance is not necessitated.

Holy Scripture abounds in statements which show conclusively that grace is not indefectible, and gives us stern examples of the truth of such statements. We propose briefly to examine some of the statements, and then to glance for a moment at some of its examples.

First, our Lord Himself applies the case of Lot's wife to His own disciples. He says to them, "Remember Lot's wife!"[2] He warns them that though placed in a high condition of grace, and called with a glorious call, yet may they turn back, turn out of the path upon which their feet have been planted by the grace of God, and perish. "Watch, for ye know not at what hour the Lord cometh. Let your loins be girded about and your lights burning, and ye yourselves like unto men that wait for their Lord. Blessed are those servants whom the Lord, when he cometh, shall find watching."[3] Is this language applicable to the fact that those once admitted into the service of the Lord can never afterwards be rejected from it? So our Saviour cautions His disciples in these words, "Take heed to yourselves lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting and drunkenness and cares of this life, and so that day come upon you unawares.... watch ye therefore and pray always that ye may be accounted worthy to escape all these things that shall come to pass and to stand before the Son of Man."[4] Surely this care, vigilance, and constant prayer urged upon the disciples, shows that without them they were not likely to escape these judgments, and also that they might be subjected to the happening of events which might render them unable to stand before the Son of Man with assurance, and in safety.

St. Paul clearly intimates that if the Colossians did not

[1] Matt. xxiv. 13.
[2] Luke xvii. 32.
[3] Luke xii. 35, 36, 37.
[4] Luke xxi. 34-36.

"continue in the faith grounded and settled," but should be "moved from the hope of the Gospel" (which supposition were folly, if the thing supposed were impossible) they should not be "presented holy, unblameable, and unreprovable in God's sight," and consequently have no admittance to heaven.[1] And in speaking of the great apostacy of the latter days, he says, "the spirit saith expressly that in the latter times some should depart from the faith."[2] In writing to the Philippians, in whom as he says, "God had begun the good work," he exhorts them to "hold fast the word of life and to stand fast in the Lord."[3] A most unnecessary and unreasonable exhortation if they were not able to do otherwise. So when he exhorts these same converts to "work out their own salvation with fear and trembling;"[4] what can be his meaning if salvation were assured to them quite irrespective of their conduct, and what ground of fear could there be had God infallibly decreed to confer this salvation and to afford those means which must of necessity produce it? In writing to the Galatians he is equally apprehensive lest "he should have bestowed upon them labour in vain."[5] He says, "Ye did run well, who hindered you that you should not obey the truth?"[6] Further he declares that the Thessalonians had "received the word with much affliction, and yet with joy of the Holy Ghost and much assurance, not in word only, but in power, that they had shewed the work of faith, and labour of love and patience of hope in Christ Jesus,"[7] and were the elect of God "in whom the word wrought effectually;"[8] and yet he expresses his fears lest Satan should have tempted them so far as to render all his labours among them vain."[9]

The Epistle to the Hebrews is full of exhortations on the danger of falling away. Some have even supposed that this epistle was written expressly against the doctrine of final perseverance.[10] It is addressed to those who were "holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling." The writer evidently could have held no such doctrine as final perseverance in the Calvinistic sense, when he exhorts his hearers to remain "stedfast unto the

[1] Col. i. 22. [2] 1 Tim. iv. 1. [3] Phil. i. 1, 11, 16.
[4] Phil. i. 6; ii. 12. [5] Gal. iv. 11.

[6] "At first," says Luther, "the Galatians heard and obeyed the truth. Therefore when Paul saith, 'Who hath bewitched you?' he signifies that now being bewitched by the false apostles, they had fallen away from and forsaken that truth which formerly they had obeyed." And further he says, "He had said before that seeking justification by the law, they cast away the grace of God; and that Christ died for them in vain. Here he adds, that such persons crucify Christ, who had formerly lived and reigned in them. As if he should say, you have not only *cast away the grace* of God, it is not only true that Christ died for you in vain, but that He is most unworthily crucified in (by or amongst) you."

[7] 1 Thess. i. 3, 5, 6. [8] *Ib.* ii. 13. [9] *Ib.* iii. 5.

[10] It is thought that the same might be said of St. Peter's second Epistle. See ii. 20, &c., iii. 18, and 2 John 8, "Look to yourselves, that we lose not those things which we have wrought, but that we receive a full reward."

end."[1] He certainly supposes the saints might "fail of the rest prepared for the people of God,"[2] that they might "depart from the Living God,"[3] that they might "decline from their hope,"[4] and "cast away their confidence;"[5] that they might "faint under and give over the christian combat,"[6] might "let their hands hang down, and their knees be feeble;"[7] that they might become "fornicators and profane persons as Esau was," and so might lose their spiritual birthright;[8] and that they might 'turn away from Him who spoke from heaven to them."[9]

So this danger is implied in the many exhortations "to hold fast the hope;"[10] to hold fast the confidence stedfast to the end;[11] to hold fast their profession;[12] to hold fast the profession of their faith without wavering;[13] to retain grace whereby to serve God acceptably,[14] and in many other passages.

Then there are numerous examples both in the Old and New Testament verifying the truth of the warnings we have seen are so abundant. Angels kept not their first estate.[15] Man fell from his creation, standing, though furnished with every weapon needful for a successful warfare. Lot's wife, though delivered by the direct interposition of God, from the judgments which God poured out upon the cities of the plain, yet looked back and perished. She perished not in the guilty city, but after deliverance and in the very way of safety having found grace in the sight of the Lord. The whole generation of the chosen people, save two persons, perished in the wilderness because of unbelief. It is true we know not what the eternal condition of any of these persons may be, but they are instances cited in the New Testament as examples to us upon whom the ends of the world are come,[16] lest we elected in Christ Jesus should have received the grace of God in vain and fall from the high position to which we have been called in the providence and mercy of God.

There are examples, too, in the New Testament. We may specially cite the case of Judas. He was numbered with the twelve. He went about with our Lord. He was "the familiar friend in whom He trusted, with whom He took sweet counsel, and walked into the house of God in company."[17] He with the other Apostles had preached the Gospel and wrought miracles. He had been chosen to be one of the princes to occupy the throne as Judges of the twelve Tribes of Israel,[18] and yet he fell from grace and betrayed His Lord. He failed to resist the temptation of the world, and either through fear or covetousness he followed the bent of his own inclination and ensnared by the Devil forsook his high calling and standing.

So, too, in Hymenæus and Alexander and their associates we

[1] Heb. iii. 6, 14. [2] *Ib.* iv. 11. [3] *Ib.* iii. 12. [4] *Ib.* x. 23. [5] *Ib.* 35. [6] *Ib.* xii. 3. [7] *Ib.* 11. [8] *Ib.* 16, 17. [9] *Ib.* 23. [10] *Ib.* iii. 16. [11] *Ib.* 14. [12] *Ib.* iv. 14. [13] *Ib.* x. 23. [14] *Ib.* xii. 28. [15] Jude vi. [16] 1 Cor. x. 11. [17] Ps. lv. 14. [18] S. Matt. xix. 28.

have a melancholy example of men who having once stood in grace, finally fell away. St. Paul says, they made shipwreck of the faith, and he charges Timothy accordingly to hold "faith and a good conscience."[1] So of Hymenæus and Philetus who, says the Apostle, "concerning the truth have erred, or missed the mark (περὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἠστόχησαν), or have missed the mark and overthrown the faith of some."[2] By "overthrowing" is evidently meant an utter and total destruction of the faith. It is clear then that the Apostle thought that those who had begun in the spirit might have their faith "overthrown" and end in the flesh, and that those who had been once in grace might finally cease to remain under its power and influence. But to meet any objection which might possibly arise in the minds of some as to the effect of such falls on the purpose of God, and to assert the stability of the truth of God in the Gospel by way of antidote to the fears of those who might suspect it from the defection of others, the Apostle adds, by way of antithesis, "Nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, the Lord knoweth them that are His, and let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity."[3] The words in the original are ὁ μέντοι στερεὸς θεμέλιος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἕστηκεν κ.τ.λ., *i.e.*, "the stable," or sure "foundation of God," standeth, or hath stood, &c. The foundation is said to be στερεὸς, "firm," or stable, because it is nothing less than the word of God, who "cannot lie" or deceive, and it is said to "stand," or to have stood, ἕστηκε, because it never failed any one who built upon it.

It is said by some that Hymenæus, Alexander, and Philetus were but feigned believers and had at no time true faith, but there is nothing to support this gratuitous assumption. The fact of excommunication, the delivering up unto Satan by the Apostle[4] was an act of judgment properly passable only on those who had received grace and been united to Christ, and who were by a judicial act severed from the Body of Christ and the Communion of Saints.

It is, however, urged that there are passages which speak in clear terms of the final perseverance of the saints and of the impossibility of such falling from grace. We propose briefly to refer to some of these passages. It is written, "With Him is no variableness, neither shadow of *turning*."[5] "I am the Lord, I change *not*; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed."[6] But these and like expressions only go to shew that the Being of God—His essence and the principles by which He acts towards man, change not. He unchangeably loves righteousness and hates iniquity. He is the rewarder of the righteous, and the punisher of the wicked. If one day a man is righteous and another day wicked, reward or punishment will be meted out to him according to the

[1] 1 Tim. i. 19.
[2] 2 Tim. ii. 18.
[3] 2 Tim. ii. 19.
[4] 1 Tim. i, 20.
[5] James i. 17.
[6] Mal. iii. 6.

unchangeableness of God. It would be absurd to hold that as God cannot change, therefore a man who did righteously yesterday and does wickedly to-day must in both conditions receive a reward!

Again it is said, "The gifts and calling of God are without repentance."[1] As here the Apostle is evidently referring to the calling of the Jewish nation, it does not affect the point. Again it is written, "Those whom Thou hast given Me have I kept and none of them is lost but the son of perdition."[2] This is evidently spoken of the twelve Apostles only, as may be seen from the context. Besides, it refers not only to a spiritual keeping but (as the next chapter shews) to a preservation from temporal death, Christ requesting that His disciples might be permitted to go away when He was apprehended "that this saying of His might be fulfilled."[3]

Then it is said the elect cannot fall away because our Lord says, "false Christs and false prophets shall arise who shall deceive, *if it were* possible, the very elect."[4] But the phrase εἰ δυνατόν "if it be possible, if it may be," does not denote an absolute impossibility such as is assumed, but only a great difficulty in the performance of an act possible. So in the Acts[5] it is said, "Paul hastened εἰ δυνατὸν εἴη αὐτῷ, *if it were possible* for him to be at Jerusalem before Pentecost." He would surely never have attempted to do what was absolutely impossible. It is only the difficulty of the thing which is shewn. So in the epistle to the Romans[6] the Apostle commands us, εἰ δυνατόν, *if it be possible* as much as in us lies "to have peace with all men." If we suppose that "if it be possible" implies a physical impossibility, the sentence would run "as much as in you lies do that which you cannot do, or which is impossible for you to do." There is no reason to conceive the possibility or impossibility in question to be anything but that moral possibility or impossibility which the nature of the subject admits of.

Further, it will be well to bear in mind the effect of holding that the words "if it were possible" relate to an absolute impossibility. We should have our Lord giving a caution which was entirely meaningless. The warning was spoken for the sake of the Elect, and if there were no possibility of their being seduced by any means whatever, could there be any advantage in warning such men against seducers? Can we consider it probable that our Lord would seriously warn his disciples to take heed of that happening to them which He knew it was utterly impossible could happen?

Another passage cited is, They "who are kept by the power of God, through faith to salvation."[7] But this passage only proves

[1] Rom. xi. 29. [2] S. John xvii. 12. [3] S. John xviii. 8.
[4] S. Matt. xxiv. 24. [5] Acts xx. 16. [6] Rom. xii. 18. [7] 1 Pet. i. 5.

that all who are preserved to salvation are so kept by the power of God, which is evident; it does not prove that all who have been once believers are kept undefiled to the end. The words are plain that they are kept "through faith"; that is, if they continue in the faith rooted and grounded, and are not removed from the hope of the Gospel,[1] if they hold the beginning of their confidence stedfast to the end.[2]

Again, the doctrine is drawn from the words of our Lord, "Whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him as a well of water springing up unto everlasting life"[3]; and "he that cometh to Me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on Me shall never thirst."[4] The import of these words seems to be that the Holy Spirit will abide for ever with those who do not by their sins expel Him, and so abiding He will for ever quench and satisfy their thirst after eternal life as being in them the earnest of their future inheritance. Remember, too, the words are not he that "hath believed on Him," but he that "believeth on Him," ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν[5] that is, continues to believe.

Again, it is asserted that as our Lord has said His sheep shall never perish, they shall never fall away finally. But this promise is simply that His sheep shall never perish through any defect on His part, and this is shewn in the context, "for none shall pluck them out of My hand."[6]

Further, it is urged that when the Apostle says, "whom He justified them He also glorified,"[7] he shews that those who are once justified cannot fall from grace because they cannot fail of glory. But the word, ἐδόξασε, "He has glorified them," is according to the highest authorities, "He has made them glorious by giving them His Holy Spirit." And hence we see that any argument founded on a rendering which would give to the word "glorified" a future sense, or would imply that the word "glorified" meant glorified in an eternal sense and future condition, would be built on a wrong interpretation of the word.[8]

Then it is urged that the Lord has declared that He would found His Church upon a rock, and that the gates of hell should never prevail against her, and it is on this promise that the dogma of the indefectibility of the saints and the final perseverance of every individual among the elect has been mainly founded both by Augustine and Calvin. But the promise was made to the Church, not to any particular individuals.

It is the Church collectively which must stand fast for ever, it is not the individuals composing it. They, it is alas too true, may fall away from grace. The promises of God in regard to Predestination and Election must be understood *generically* and not

[1] Col. i. 23.
[2] Heb. iii. 14.
[3] S. John iv. 14.
[4] S. John vi. 35.
[5] John iii. 18, 36.
[6] John x. 28.
[7] Rom. viii. 30.
[8] *ante* p. 200.

specifically, that is, as referring to the whole Church collectively, and not to certain individuals particularly.

It is, therefore, the Church *generically* which must, according to the Divine decree, finally persevere, and be exalted with honour and glory, not the individual members of the Church specifically who may finally fall away from grace and fail to obtain the prize of their high calling in Christ Jesus.

When St. Peter says, "Give diligence to make your calling and election sure,"[1] he certainly considers it possible that we might not do so, and might fall away from grace. If means are necessary, the end must be uncertain, so far as our knowledge can go. The Calvinists argue that the end is certain, and some of them, that means are unnecessary; but they mostly contend that where the end is decreed so are the means also, and conversely, where the means for securing a certain end are not employed, the end will not be attained,—not because the purposes of God can be frustrated, but because we may be sure that in this case it was not His purpose that that end should be attained. Eternal life, say they, is the end to which God has appointed his elect, faith and perseverance are the means which lead to it.

A favourite illustration of theirs on this point is that recorded in the 27th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles.

It is the account of Paul's voyage to Rome. During the storm, and when destruction seemed inevitable, the Apostle stood up in the midst of the sailors and said, "Sirs, be of good cheer, for there shall be no loss of any man's life among you, but of the ship." Paul derived his assurance from the Lord, and the safety of the men was secured by an infallible decree. And yet shortly after he declared to them that unless they stayed in the ship they could not be saved. Here, the Calvinists say, it is clear the means were decreed as well as the end. But though we may readily admit that where the end is decreed the means are also, the narrative of St. Paul's shipwreck does not seem to support either the one view or the other. Promises such as these are *antecedently absolute* as to their *making;* but they are *subsequently conditional* as to their *performance.* Thus Christ does not say, "If you will promise to endure to the end, I will promise that you shall be saved; but whether you promise this or not I promise that he that endures to the end, the same shall be saved"; so that the salvation depends upon enduring to the end. Though God has absolutely promised salvation to him who perseveres in faith to the end, yet He has nowhere absolutely promised that some men shall be forced to believe, much less that every one that *once* believed shall *always* persevere in believing.

The Westminster Confession of Faith on the subject is in effect much the same as the articles of the Synod of Dort, though perhaps

[1] 2 Pet i. 10.

not quite so cautiously guarded in expression. This confession declares that:—"They whom God hath accepted in His beloved, effectually called and sanctified by His Spirit can neither totally nor finally[1] fall away from the state of grace; but shall certainly persevere therein to the end, and be eternally saved.

"This perseverance of the saints depends not upon their own free-will, but upon the immutability of the decree of election, flowing from the free and unchangeable love of God the Father; upon the efficacy of the merit and intercession of Jesus Christ; the abiding of the Spirit, and of the seed of God within them; and the nature of the covenant of grace; from all which ariseth also the certainty and infallibility thereof."[2]

"The most wise, righteous, and gracious God doth oftentimes leave for a season His own children to manifold temptations, and the corruptions of their own hearts to chastise them for their former sins, and to discover unto them the hidden strength of corruption and the deceitfulness of their hearts, that they may be humbled; and to raise them to a more close and constant dependence for their support upon Himself, and to make them more watchful against all future occasions of sin, and for sundry other just and holy ends."[3]

By this system the destiny of the elect is set forth as fixed and unchangeable for salvation by virtue of the decree of election.

It is certainly a truth of God that if the elect persevere they can do so only through God's grace, but the perseverance of none is absolutely assured in this life. We know God has a seed which shall serve Him, and which shall be triumphant and infallibly come to eternal happiness and joy, but this truth is at present the object of faith and hope. We dare not apply the object of our faith to our own case and assert that we are infallibly decreed to everlasting happiness except on the condition of continued faithfulness unto the end. We know and are thankful ever to God that He has by His grace put us in a condition of salvation—that He has called us into His kingdom of light. We may take to ourselves the words of the Lord to Israel, "O Israel fear not, for I have redeemed thee; I have called thee by thy name, thou art mine. When thou passest through the waters, I will be with thee, and through the rivers they shall not overflow thee, when thou walkest through the fire thou shalt not be burnt;"[4] but whether we persevere faithfully unto the end must depend on whether we are willing to humble ourselves, submit our wills to

[1] The statement that they can neither *totally* or *finally* fall away was intended to meet the idea of some of the Lutheran divines who taught that believers might fall away totally but not finally. They considered that some who had once believed might lose altogether the privilege of their condition into which they had been brought by believing so as to become as bad as they were before believing; but that all such persons would be again brought *de novo* into a state of grace, and that thus they might fall away or apostatize totally but not finally.

[2] West. Conf. chap. xvii. § 1, 2. [3] Ib. chap. v. § 5. [4] Is. xliii. 1, 2.

His will, allow ourselves to be fitted and fashioned for the eternal places our Lord hath gone to prepare for us, in His mansions of light above.

The real difficulty which exists with many is that they conceive that the operation at the same time of God's grace and man's optional power, must leave it open to man to consider himself his own saviour. They argue that if there be universal grace conferring on all the knowledge of good and evil, and if the will of God for their salvation, then the reception of the truth by one rather than by another being the effect of his own will, he is to some extent dependent upon himself for his salvation. They consider that the Divine supremacy cannot reveal itself through the free actions of creatures under a common grace so as to produce the above result, and they fly to the expedient of assuming that the Holy Spirit bestows on some a different measure or character of grace to what He does on others. But the assumption is theologically false and entirely unnecessary, for the admission of free-will to co-operate with the grace of God is not open to the objection raised. The exercise of our free-will, which it must be remembered is God's own gift to us, is solely in consequence of His permission and His desire that we should remain responsible moral agents.

Some imagine that the denial of an absolute unconditional decree is a detraction from the glory of God and a slur upon His immutability. For this, say they, is fixing the salvation of man on his own voluntary fulfilment of certain conditions. It is practically the same argument as the last, dressed up in a different style, and the reasoning is equally unsound.

It cannot be doubted but that God works in man by means of the powers He has endued him with,[1] but it does not follow that

[1] "We must acknowledge," says Dr. Jortin, "that as the natural abilities with which God hath originally endowed men, are such as they can either use or neglect according to their choice and inclination; so the supernatural assistances afforded to men by the revelation of the Gospel and by the influence of the Spirit, are still in the nature of assistances, which may either be received or rejected."—Diss. on Eccles. Hist. "The terms of Scripture represent the Spirit of God," says Paley, "as an assisting, not forcing power, as not suspending our own powers, but enabling them; as imparting strength and faculty for religious work, if we will use them; but whether we will use them or not, still depending upon ourselves. Agreeably hereunto St. Paul asserts that there is no condemnation to them, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. The promise is not to them who have the Spirit, but to them who walk after the Spirit. To walk after the flesh is to follow wherever the impulses of sensuality and selfishness lead us, which is a voluntary act. To walk after the Spirit, is steadily and resolutely to obey good motions within us, whatever they cost us; which also is a voluntary act. All the language of this remarkable chapter (Rom. vii.) proceeds in the same strain; namely, that after the Spirit of God is given, it remains and rests with ourselves whether we avail ourselves of it or not! "If ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the flesh, ye shall live." It is through the Spirit that we are enabled to mortify the deeds of the flesh. But still, whether we mortify them or not, is our act, because it is made a subject of precept and exhortation so to do. Health is God's gift; but what use we will make of it is our choice. Bodily strength is God's gift; but of what advantage it shall be to us depends upon ourselves. Even, so, the higher gift of the Spirit remains a gift, the value of which will be exceedingly great; will be little; will be none; will be even an increase of guilt and condemnation, according as it is applied and obeyed, or

man should rely on the powers themselves. This would be wrong and opposed to the life of faith which relies on that which is unseen—the operation of the Spirit of God on the powers—and does not rest in assurance on the powers themselves. It has been truly said that in the operation of grace in men, God does everything, yet He does nothing: and man does nothing, yet he does everything: God's Being, the only efficient, does not, in any degree, mingle itself with that of man; man's being, in itself all sin and weakness, is, by God's grace, made strong for faith and righteousness—such is the paradox of faith.[1] The writer last quoted goes on to say:—"The state of mind in question tries to escape this essential character of faith, by substituting for trust in genuine divine action, the certainty arising from an operation, which impresses in the subject powers or tendencies of necessary effect in producing the contemplated end; in other words, by substituting for the operation of the free, though, in themselves impotent powers of man under grace, a supernatural law producing an infallible result. It is perplexed and unsatisfied with an incomprehensible operation; although this is so much among the elements of God's ways towards men, as to have been denominated by our Lord in His conversation with Nicodemus 'earthly things,' and represented as an indispensable preliminary to further Divine knowledge."

The last point the Calvinists make much of, and ever aim as a parting shaft at their oppponents is that their dogma of final perseverance is so comforting, while the contrary doctrine of the possibility of the falling away of the saints is so destructive of the peace and comfort of believers, that the former is much more compatible with the admitted assurance of the soldier of the Cross than the latter.

But comforting was the doctrine of the Valentinians, who held that they were perfect and children of the election receiving grace from the inexpressible conjunction, so that it was impossible they should be corrupted whatever they did. Comforting also was the doctrine of the Antinomians to men of carnal minds, yet very destructive of that condition to which it is the object of the Gospel to bring them. It is, however, doubtful whether the impious persuasions of these and kindred heretics could actually remove the fears arising from the dictates of the natural conscience and monitions of that Spirit which God has given His creature, but it may be safely assumed that they could not remove the fears and doubts arising from the dictates of a conscience enlightened by the Word of God and a soul indwelt by His Spirit.

As to the doctrine of Calvin, it is open to question whether on

neglected and withstood. The 4th chapter of Ephesians, verse 30, is a warning voice upon the subject: "Grieve not the Spirit of God; therefore He may be grieved; being given, He may be rejected; rejected He may be withdrawn." Serm. p. 423.

[1] McClelland, Pred. and Free-will, p. 182.

examination it is actually so comforting as is assumed by some; for what real comfort can there be in the fact that a true believer can never fall from grace when there can be no real assurance whatever that the individual ever stood in grace or was a true believer? For the Calvinist has to hold that all those who have fallen away at any time were necessarily hypocrites or pretenders only to true faith—some who for a time it was impossible to distinguish from so-called true believers. Surely there must arise doubts and fears about one's own position as to whether one is a true believer or not, equal at least to those alleged to exist in the minds of those who hold the doctrine that even saints may fall from grace. What great comfort can there be in knowing that true believers cannot fall from grace, when the very doctrine itself deprives the individual of any certain ground of assurance that he is a true believer? St. Paul, who certainly held the possibility of his falling away, fearing that, "having preached to others, he might become himself a castaway,"[1] seems to have had a high degree of comfort, and to have lived not so much in fear as in joy. "I am persuaded," said he, "that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."[2] "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; hereafter there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord the righteous Judge shall give me in that day, and not to me only but unto all them also that love his appearing."[3] What words could be stronger as expressive of assurance than these words of the Apostle? Notwithstanding the possibility of falling away, he rested his assurance of glory in the unchangeable purpose of God to preserve His saints and raise them in glory, if only they persevere in faith and holiness unto the end. This can be the only true ground of assurance, and what Bellarmine says is most true that a man may collect so much by infallible assurance and divine, if he look into the faithfulness of Him that promises, but if he consider his own disposition, we assign no more but probable and conjectural assurance only.

But fear itself is sometimes helpful to the Christian, and is in Holy Scripture opposed to highmindedness. "Be not highminded but fear."[4] It arises from the true and prayerful contemplation of the individual's own weakness and insufficiency to stand in his own strength. This leads to dependence—humble dependence upon God for strength and ability to stand, with an admission of the truth that strength and ability to abide in faith come from above. Therefore we are exhorted to "Work out our salvation with fear and trembling,"[5] *i.e.*, with humility, with a sense and

[1] 1 Cor. ix. 27. [2] Rom. viii. 38, 39. [3] 2 Tim. iv. 7, 8. [4] Rom. xi. 20. [5] Phil. ii. 12.

acknowledgment of the impotency of the creature and the power, goodness, and love of the Creator, "For it is God that worketh in us both to will and to do of His good pleasure."[1]

The knowledge of the infirmities and weaknesses of the saints are not properly grounds for fear that they shall fall away, for the admission of such is helpful in keeping the individual in a proper condition of humility and of dependence for strength on Him who is both able and willing to supply all that is requisite and wanting.

It is most true that the gifts of grace are not *indefectible.* The whole Church here is engaged in a perpetual warfare, and only he who overcometh and endureth to the end shall make his calling and election sure. For this cause we are exhorted to watch and pray that we fall not into temptation. Our being "once enlightened" will not avail us unless we continue faithfully to walk in the light of the Gospel—our having tasted of the heavenly gift and having been made partakers of the Holy Ghost will but increase our condemnation. For the higher we have been lifted up the deeper and severer will be our fall.

Perhaps the greatest evil which arises from the doctrine of Final Perseverance as held by Calvin and his followers is the ignoring of our true position here. It leads men to forget that they are here in a state of trial and probation, for it is evident that if they are irresistibly compelled one way or the other, so as that they are not in fact free agents,[2] and their destiny is unalter-

[1] Phil. ii. 13.

[2] President Edwards, in defending his favourite doctrine of necessity, uses the following argument :—"The Arminians say that if we act necessarily we are neither worthy of blame nor of praise. But the devil, who is punished, and who therefore is blameworthy, is necessarily wicked, he has no liberty to be good. And God is necessarily good, He has not liberty to be wicked." Hence he assumes that reprobates may be necessarily wicked, like the devil, and yet be justly punished; and the Elect, be necessarily good like God, and yet be worthy of reward. The Rev. John Fletcher, who quotes this argument in his Equal Check to the Pharisaism and Antinomianism, after pointing out that God is enthroned in goodness, far above the region of evil, and that the devil is sunk far below the region of virtue and bliss, thus demolishes the President's position : "Man inhabits," says he, "if I may use the expression, a middle region between heaven and hell; a region where light and darkness, virtue and vice, good and evil, blessing and cursing, are yet before him, *and where he is in a state of probation;* that he may be rewarded with heaven or punished with hell, according to his good or bad works. It is, then, as absurd in President Edwards to confound our liberty with that of God, and of the devil, as it would be in a geographer to confound the equinoctial lines with the two poles. A comparison may illustrate this conclusion. As the mechanical liberty of a pair of just scales consists in a power gradually to ascend as high, or to descend as low, as the play of the beam permits ; so the moral liberty of rationals in a state of probation consists in a gracious power gradually to ascend in goodness quite to their zenith in heaven, and in a natural power to descend in wickedness quite to their nadir in hell; so immensely great is the play of the moral scales! God's will, by the perfection of His nature, being immovably fixed in the height of all goodness, cannot stoop to an inferior good, much less to evil; and the devil, being sunk in the depth of all wickedness, and daily confirming himself in his iniquity, can no more rise in pursuit of goodness. Thus the presence of all wickedness keeps the scale of the Prince of Darkness fixedly sunk to the nethermost hell, while the absence of all unrighteousness keeps the scale of the Father of Lights fixedly raised to the highest pitch of heavenly excellence. God is then quite above, and Satan quite below, a state of probation. The one is good, and the other evil, in the highest degree of moral necessity. Not so man, who hovers yet

ably determined by a decree of God, the present as a time of trial and probation must be a delusion. For how can this condition be a trial and a test as to whether men shall prove worthy of eternal life if their wills are constrained and their conduct depends simply upon an absolute decree? How can they regard this life as a strife wherein they are to struggle for the mastery hoping to win a crown? How can they experience the feelings of those engaged in a race, looking to the Author of their salvation lest they faint and weary in their minds? What is all the battle of life? What is the shield of faith? What are the fiery darts of the enemy? Can there be any real strife for the mastery, any real crowning of the victors, when for some, however ill they fight, victory is inevitable; and for others, however bravely they contend, defeat and disgrace must be equally certain? Must not all these things be but a dream?

The doctrine, too, of final perseverance, as held by the Calvinists, is destructive of all the motives offered in Scripture to continue to persevere in righteousness, and to bring forth fruit unto holiness, that the end may be eternal life.[1]

For an absolute decree both of the reward and the means conducive thereto leaves no opening for the exercise of self-denial, or for the putting forth of those gifts and graces which are entrusted to us during our time of probation. It excludes both hope and

between the world of light and the world of darkness; man, who has life and death, salvation and damnation, placed within his reach, and who is called to 'stretch forth his hand' to that which he will have, that 'the reward of his hands' may 'be given him.'"—Vol. 3, p. 432.

[1] Seckendorf remarks, that Luther, Bugenhagius, and Melancthon jointly expressed their disapprobation of a certain production, because the author of it had contemplated predestination in a dangerous point of view, and had maintained that the Elect lose not the Holy Spirit, when they fall into manifest crimes. "Asseverant autem," he adds, "*se semper unanimiter* in omnibus Ecclesiis *contrarium* docuisse; nempe si quis sanctus et fidelis sciens et ex proposito contra præcepta Dei peccet, non amplius esse sanctum, sed *veram fidem et Spiritum Sanctum abjecisse*"—(Vol. ii. lib. iii. p. 135.) Upon such a principle then Luther conceived, that many begin well, but fail in the midst of their Christian labours; "Multi præclare incipiunt, sed in medio fessi *finem deserunt*;" vol. v., p. 67, and that it is impossible to determine who will remain faithful: "Non potest quidem certo demonstrari, quis futurus posthac sit, aut *mansurus* inter eos, quos Christo dedit Pater." Seckendorf, vol. ii., p. 85. In the Saxon Confession, likewise, the same subject is directly noticed. "Manifestum est aliquos renatos contristare et *excutere* Spiritum Sanctum, et *rursus abjici* a Deo, ac fieri reos *iræ Dei*, et *æternarum pœnarum* . . . . Cum igitur homines non retinent fidem . . . . aut violant ullum præceptum Dei contra conscientiam, *effundunt* Spiritum Sanctum, et rursus fiunt *rei iræ Dei et pœnæ æternæ*; et nisi fiat conversio, tales morientes *abjiciuntur in æternas pœnas*." De Discrimine Peccati. Thus, too, for the express purpose of proving that a fall from grace may be final, as well as total, Melancthon frequently referred to the example of Saul. "Exempla cogitemus Saulis et Davidis, qui et beneficia, quæ recensui, tenuerunt ante lapsum, et post lapsam *exuti* tantis bonis, pœnas senserunt, quas recitavi. Et Saul *prorsus periit, oppressus æternis pœnis*; David vero rursus ad Deum conversus est." Loci Theolog. p. 431. But in other passages he is, if possible, still more explicit: "Qui aguntur Spiritu Sancto, hi sunt filii Dei: sed ruentes contra conscientiam, effundunt et perturbant Spiritum Sanctum; *desinunt* igitur *esse filii Dei*." Ibid. p. 280. Affirmo etiam labentes in talia scelera excutere Spiritum Sanctum, et rursus fieri reos æternæ pœnæ, quorum *aliqui* redeuntes ad pœnitentiam, ut Aaron, David, rursus ad Deum convertuntur, et recipiuntur in gratiam; *multi non redeuntes ruunt in æternas pœnas*." Op. vol. i. p. 375; cited Laurence on Articles, 4 Ed. p. 365.

fear, unlike the true promise, which suspends the reward upon our own diligence in the use of the means, and which permits their free exercise. For what we are not sure of we can hope for, and fear to lose; but that which we are sure of we can no longer hope for, nor fear not to attain unto. Upon this scheme of doctrine Lot's wife might have remained at the gate of Sodom, concluding that because the angels had taken her by the hand she was already in Zoar or some other place of safety. It is against such a delusion as this that the words of our Lord are addressed, "Remember Lot's wife."

The doctrine of final perseverance is also objectionable, as tending to make us look with suspicion on our brethren; for we can never know but what they are hypocrites, and mere formal professors. It may be said with truth, neither can we know this if we hold not this doctrine; but it is the natural tendency of the doctrine to engender suspicion in the mind. For the holders of the doctrine are forced to hold that if a man is once in grace he is always so; and we cannot discern those we know now of our brethren to be better than some we have known in time past, who by reason of their having fallen away since we are required by the doctrine to regard as mere hypocrites or false professors. If then, by reason of the apostacy of some of those whom we had every reason to believe were spiritually minded, and were in grace, and walked in the commandments of the Law blameless, we are forced to consider that they could not have done so, but were mere hypocrites, it is impossible but to regard with an eye of suspicion those who seem now to us to be most sincere and faultless in their walk and conversation. The strong minded may think nothing of this tendency, and say, perhaps justly, it should not exist. But we are referring here not to things as they should be so much as as they are, and, apologising to the strong minded, let us pass on.

The doctrine of indefectibility in the saints is not only directly contrary, as we have seen, to the letter of Scripture and to the position in which revelation shows we are now placed, but it renders meaningless all the gracious counsel and warning of the Holy Ghost respecting the hostility and the evil intentions of Satan against them. We have to believe that none of those for whom Christ died can be "cast out"—that no virgin's lamp "can go out"—no seed of the word be "choked with thorns"—no name be "blotted out of God's book"—no "salt" lose its savour—nobody "receive the grace of God in vain," "bury his talent," "neglect such great salvation," "grieve the Spirit," and much more, directly contrary to the letter of Scripture. This doctrine also renders less valuable, if not entirely valueless, the operation of the Holy Spirit in making known to the saints the designs of the Evil One, and His guidance and assistance in contending with him.

Examine the following passages: Matt. xii. 43, 44, &c.; 1 Cor. vii. 5; 2 Cor. xi. 3, 14; ii. 11; Eph. vi. 11, 12; 2 Thess. ii. 9, 10; 1 Pet. v. 8, 9; James iv. 7, and point out the value of the assistance of the Holy Ghost if there be no possibility of the saints being finally overcome by Satan, and of their falling from grace once received.

No man of any judgment would think of admonishing another in the most serious and solemn terms of a danger threatening him, giving him directions and counsel how to escape this danger when both know very well that it were an absolute impossibility that the danger so solemnly and seriously warned against could occur. And yet this is what the supporters of the indefectibility of the saints have to attribute to the Holy Ghost.

The doctrine makes the preaching of the Gospel one of the most wicked things in the world. What can be more wicked than to distress elect sinners by bidding them "fly from the wrath to come," if there is absolutely no wrath to fly from—if as some Calvinists say their sins, "be they more or less, be they small or great, they are for ever and for ever cancelled." And as to the reprobate, how wicked to bid them fly, when eternal decrees of God bind them down perpetually and by no effort whatever can they escape from future wrath. Another serious objection to the doctrine is that it is utterly inconsistent with that of the final judgment of all men according to the deeds done in the body.[1] For how can we ascribe to the Almighty the farce of passing a most solemn doom on each man according to his works, when there was no decision, no judging, no weighing of the works of the man, when his doom had been decided without regard to his character or his works, from all eternity, by an absolute and sovereign decree.

No, indeed, if one thing is clearer than another from Holy Scripture it is this:—That at no period of the pilgrim's walk through life is he safe from falling through obstinacy or sin. It is a wise provision of the Almighty. He knows the effects of hopes and fears, trials, sorrows, and tribulations. He has ordained that true piety and virtue should be strengthened by exercise and by trial, that motives to sin by the constant exercise of His gifts in opposition should gradually lose their charm and force, that the longer we persevere in "keeping the body under, and bringing it into subjection" the easier becomes the triumph of the spirit over the flesh, and that the more often we conquer in the fight the more established becomes our strength.

The faith of the child of God is exercised in a path of trial and temptation, and at every step he has to feel the need of his Father's loving hand to sustain him in his warfare with the pomps and vanities of this world—the temptations within and

[1] Rom. ii. 5-11; Rev. xx. 12-13.

without whereby he is assailed. The further we are led on, the greater the grace we receive from above, the severer the trials and temptations which will assail us. For as the apostle says, we war not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places. The evil one knows how we are progressing, and as we do so his attacks become the sharper. Let us not then fall into the folly of supposing that we cannot totally and finally fall away. To the last moment of our lives we are exposed to this danger—to the last moment of our mortal career must we be dependent on the grace of the Holy Spirit of God to assist us onward in the path of righteousness and true holiness, and we shall only co-operate with this grace aright by bearing the truth in our heart and working out our own salvation— not with any reliance on an unconditional and irreversible decree necessarily productive of indefectible grace, but "with fear and trembling."[1]

(b) Testimony of the Old Testament.

In the following passages we shall see that though the whole house of Israel were chosen and elect, yet they were capable of falling from grace, and many in fact did so fall. It is true that as an elect nation, the chosen people will not be cast off--there will always be a remnant who will inherit the promises made to the fathers and which stand fast for ever. We must not lose sight of this truth while considering the many passages in the Old Testament showing that the elect persons as individuals may not be faithful to their call and may fail to obtain the inheritance. For truly the election of God among the Jews—that is the "called and chosen and faithful"—shall yet enjoy all that the Lord in His goodness has promised. His word on this point is distinct and clear. "Thus saith the Lord: If heaven above can be measured, and the foundations of the earth searched out beneath, I will also cast off all the seed of Israel for all that they have done, saith the Lord."[2] And again, "Considerest thou not what this people have spoken saying, The two families which the Lord hath chosen, He hath even cast them off? thus they have despised my people, that they should be no more a nation before them. Thus saith the Lord, If my covenant be not with day and night, and if I have not appointed the ordinances of heaven and earth, then will I cast away the seed of Jacob, and David my servant, so that I will not take any of his seed to be rulers over the seed of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, for I will cause their captivity to return, and have mercy on them."[3]

[1] Phil. ii. 12. [2] Jer. xxxi. 37. [3] Jer. xxxiii. 24—26.

Exod. xxxii. 33.

Whosoever hath sinned against Me (said the Lord,) him will I blot out of my book.

2 Kings xxiii. 27.

And the Lord said, I will remove Judah also out of my sight, as I have removed Israel, and will cast off this city (Jerusalem) which I have chosen (even Jerusalem) *and the house of which I said, my name shall be there.*

1 Chron. xxviii. 9.

If thou seek Him He will be found of thee, but if thou forsake Him, He will cast thee off for ever.

Psl. xliv. 23.

Awake, why sleepest thou, O Lord? arise cast us not off for ever.

Psl. lxix. 28.

Let them be blotted out of the book of the living (*or* of life) and not be written with the righteous.

Psl. lxxiv. 1.

O God, why hast Thou cast us off for ever? *why doth Thine anger smoke against the sheep of Thy pasture?*

Psl. cxxv. 4, 5.

Do good, O Lord, unto those that be good and to them that are upright in their hearts. (But) *As for such as* turn aside unto their crooked ways *the Lord shall lead them forth with the workers of iniquity.*

Isai. i. 28—31.

The destruction of the transgressors and (of) the sinners shall be together, and they that forsake the Lord *shall be consumed . . . and they shall both burn together, and none shall quench them.* See also Isai. v. 1—7; Isai. xliii. 24—25; Jer. vii. 12—16; xii. 7; Lam. ii. 5—9, iv. 11—13; Ezek. v. 11—15.

Ezek. xviii. 26.

When a righteous man turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, *and dieth in them* (or therein), *for his iniquity that he hath done* (*or* in his iniquity that he hath done) *shall he die.*

What declaration could be clearer than this? What could show more distinctly than these words the possibility of a righteous man declining from his righteousness and that unto death? "When a righteous man turneth away, &c., and dieth in them" (*i.e.*, repents not of his wickedness before his death), "for his iniquity that he hath done shall he die" (that is the second death, death everlasting). For that this death is meant is obvious from the context,

Were this not the case the prophet would be supposed thus to speak: "When a righteous man turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and dieth in them (that is, departs this natural life without repentance), for the iniquity that he hath done shall he depart this natural life." In other words, when a man dies under the guilt of sin he shall die for his sin, or because of the guilt of his sin, the same death which he dies in his sin. This is palpably absurd.

The death which God threatens is opposed to that life which is promised to repentance and perseverance in well-doing. This life is admitted to be eternal life, and not simply natural life, and the death opposed to it is clearly eternal, or the "second death." When the Apostle says, "the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life, through Christ Jesus our Lord,"[1] it is evident from the antithesis between the death and life mentioned that by death which is the wages of sin the Apostle means eternal death.

The Prophet Ezekiel was asserting another aspect of the truth enunciated by the Apostle Paul, "Know ye not the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived; neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, &c., shall inherit the kingdom of God."[2] And again, "For this ye know that no whoremonger, or unclean person, or covetous man, which is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God. Let no man deceive you with vain words; for because of these things cometh the wrath of God upon the children of disobedience."[3]

The contention that the righteous man mentioned by the Prophet Ezekiel is not a person truly righteous, but a kind of formal hypocrite or professor of righteousness, will not bear investigation; for the whole context, from verse 20 to the end of the chapter, shows that the righteous man was one truly righteous, and one who, had he persevered in the ways of righteousness, would have received the reward of the righteous man. So the wicked man who is opposed in the passage to him is evidently not a man seemingly wicked, but actually so; and the antithesis between the two which runs through the whole discourse would be destroyed if by the righteous man we were to assume that a man seemingly righteous only were intended, yet by the wicked man we were to assume that a man actually wicked (which is acknowledged to be the proper meaning on all hands) were intended.

(e) *Testimony of the New Testament.*

The ensuing passages may be referred to as showing that Eternal life is not the *immediate* object of election, and that some may fall away from grace and fail to attain the promised reward.

[1] Rom. vi. 23. [2] 1 Cor. ix. 10. [3] Eph. v. 5, 6.

Matt. xiii. 20–22.

Ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὰ πετρώδη σπαρείς, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τὸν λόγον ἀκούων καὶ εὐθὺς μετὰ χαρᾶς λαμβάνων αὐτόν· οὐκ ἔχει δὲ ῥίζαν ἐν ἑαυτῷ, ἀλλὰ πρόσκαιρός ἐστι, γενομένης δὲ θλίψεως ἢ διωγμοῦ διὰ τὸν λόγον εὐθὺς σκανδαλίζεται. ὁ δὲ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας σπαρείς, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τὸν λόγον ἀκούων, καὶ ἡ μέριμνα τοῦ αἰῶνος καὶ ἡ ἀπάτη τοῦ πλούτου συμπνίγει τὸν λόγον, καὶ ἄκαρπος γίνεται.

But he that was sown upon stony places, this is he that heareth the word, and anon with joy receiveth it; yet hath he not root in himself, but dureth for awhile: for when tribulation or persecution ariseth because of the word, straightway he stumbleth. And he that was sown among the thorns this is he that heareth the word; and the care of the world, and the deceitfulness of riches, choke the word; and he becomes unfruitful.

"Let us make use of a comparison from the Gospel," says Origen.[1] "Some stones are covered with a very little earth, upon which if the seed falls it quickly springs up, but not having root when the sun rises it is burned up and withered. And this stone is the human mind, which is hardened by negligence, and converted into stone by wickedness, for no person's mind is created stony by God, but becomes so by wickedness."

Those signified by the stony ground, are those as St. Luke expresses, οἳ πρὸς καιρὸν πιστεύουσι, who believe for a season.[2] So that those who only for a time believe, and afterwards fall away, are nevertheless mentioned by him amongst believers. The words of St. Luke are very precise. "Those on the rock are they which when they have heard, receive the word with joy: and these have no root which for a time believe, and in time of temptation fall away."

From this it appears that the hearers here described are not compared to the rock or stony ground, for the hardness of their hearts, inasmuch as they are said to receive the word with joy, and do indeed for a time truly believe. The possibility, therefore, of a final falling away of those who for a time believe with the same kind of faith as possessed by others, who persevering in it to the end are saved, is clearly asserted in this parable by our Lord Himself.

Matt. xxiv. 13.

Ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος, οὗτος σωθήσεται.

But he that endureth unto the end the same shall be saved.

From this we see first that salvation is promised if one continues, that is, if one holds out to the end, and secondly, that it is possible that he who by the promise of salvation is exhorted to persevere in faith or in love, may wax cold in the latter or deny the former and fail to secure the prize. These inferences powerfully impressed St. Bernard, who says, "I think it sufficiently

[1] Vol. i. p. 122. [2] Luke viii. 13.

plain that all such as were endued with love may not have had perseverance in love, otherwise our Lord in vain admonished His disciples, continue ye in My love; for either, if as yet they did not love, He ought not to have said, *continue*, but be in love; or if they did love already, there was no need to admonish them of perseverance, whereof they could not be deprived according to some men's opinion. And a little before, these men have no root, who for awhile believe, and in time of temptation fall away. Whence and whither do they fall? even from faith to unbelief. I ask further, could they have been saved in that faith, or could they not? If they could not, what prejudice is it to their Saviour, what joy to the tempter that they fall from thence where there was no salvation? It seemed to St. Jerome,[1] a good argument which is taken from admonitions; St. John exhorteth 'little children, keep yourselves from idols,' whence the father. 'If every one who is born of God, doth not sin, nor can be tempted of the devil, how is it that he exhorteth them to take heed that they be not tempted?'"

Matt. xxv. 26–28.

Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Πονηρὲ δοῦλε καὶ ὀκνηρέ, ᾔδεις ὅτι θερίζω ὅπου οὐκ ἔσπειρα, καὶ συνάγω ὅθεν οὐ διεσκόρπισα· ἔδει οὖν σε βαλεῖν τὸ ἀργύριόν μου τοῖς τραπεζίταις, καὶ ἐλθὼν ἐγὼ ἐκομισάμην ἂν τὸ ἐμὸν σὺν τόκῳ. ἄρατε οὖν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τὸ τάλαντον, καὶ δότε τῷ ἔχοντι τὰ δέκα τάλαντα.

His Lord answered and said unto him, Thou wicked and slothful servant, thou knewest that I reap where I sowed not, and gather where I did not strew: Thou oughtest therefore to have put my money to the exchangers, and then at my coming I should have received again mine own with usury. Take ye therefore the talent from him and give it unto him which hath the ten talents.

The whole of this parable should be considered with care—In one aspect we may regard the Christian as endowed with five talents, the Jew with two, and the heathen with one. If he that has two talents uses them to advantage, he shall "receive a reward," as shall he who by good and faithful use of his five makes five other. And the one talent is evidently as capable of a proportionate improvement or faithful use as the two or the five. God's way is not to give to every man alike, but He requires from every man according to the endowment of grace. This parable shows that the first distribution of grace and privileges is previous to all works. The choice of God precedes His preventing grace moving the barren heart.

In the last part of the parable we see illustrated the doctrine o rewarding grace. The reward is conditional—is dependent upon good or evil use made of the talents. Observe the man who had

[1] Jerome, *contr. Jovin.* lib. ii.

made five other talents came with confidence and after acknowledging the grace of his Lord in the words, "Lord thou deliverest unto me five talents," he refers to his own work, consequent upon and with the grace which had been committed to him, "Behold *I have* gained besides other five talents." His Lord instead of rebuking him and telling him he was a blind unawakened creature and a vessel of wrath for claiming that *he* had gained other talents, said "Well done, thou good and faithful servant, thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." Let it not be supposed we wish to attribute too much to the creature.

Whatever of good these servants had who had traded well with their Lord's talents was all from Him, from whom alone cometh every good and perfect gift. The good was the fruit of His Spirit working in them, and this Spirit was purchased for them by the offering of Him to whom all judgment is committed. The man who has been bred a Calvinist and thoroughly imbued with the doctrine of reprobation comes last—he has the assurance to proclaim *his* gospel even in the very ears of his Lord, "Lord, I knew thee that thou art an hard man"—thou didst make me to be a vessel of wrath from all eternity—thou broughtest me into being with the object alone of showing thy own glory in my destruction—thou gavest me but one talent of grace that my condemnation might appear the more in accord with justice. "I knew thee that thou art an hard man, reaping where thou hadst not sown, and gathering where thou didst not strew."

John x. 29.

Ὁ πατήρ μου, ὃς δέδωκέ μοι, μείζων πάντων ἐστι· καὶ οὐδεὶς δύναται ἁρπάζειν ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ πατρός.

My Father, which hath given them Me, is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of the Father's hand.

From this passage it is argued that God undertakes to preserve His sheep from final apostacy, and consequently that they cannot fall away. But let it be observed that our Lord does not say that they may not withdraw themselves from His protecting hand. The passage taken with the context will not bear the construction which is by many put upon it. It is one among the many passages of Holy Scripture in which we find that the mighty power of God is exerted in protection of His saints as such, and remaining such against all power of the Evil One or of wicked men; but it does not prove that this power is put forth to compel or necessitate them to persevere unto the end. If it were, then would their perseverance not be their perseverance, but the act of God alone, put forth and operating either with or against their wills, as the case might be.

In the 27th verse of this same chapter our Lord says, "My

sheep hear My voice, and I know them, and they follow Me." In the expression "hearing His voice," and "following Him," is evidently included the idea of continuance—their perseverance unto the end, for in the next verse He says, "And I give them eternal life." But it is argued "'once a sheep always a sheep," and some go so far as to find an argument in favour of final perseverance in this word "sheep." Having once heard the Shepherd's voice, they became His sheep, "and now," say they, "however far we may have wandered from the sound of the Shepherd's voice still we remain His sheep; for no sheep ever became a goat." This reasoning we need hardly follow in seriousness. It will be at once seen that it is taken from the parable of the sheep and the goats, and there is just this truth in it, that a man who becomes a sheep must remain one, that is, a man who is baptized becomes a child of God, and remains so throughout the whole course of his mortal existence. The act of God made him a child, and gave him the life of the Son of God, and as a child of God he will be judged hereafter. No act of man's can make him less than God has made him, though it may increase his condemnation. A wicked child may be disowned by his parents—may be cut off from every privilege and blessing which he might have enjoyed had he been obedient and dutiful, but he still remains a child—and so until the judgment of God has passed upon his baptized children, and cut them off for ever from the one family of God, we must recognize them as such. The idea of the sheep, however, and the purpose for which it is sometimes used is simply absurd, for on the same principle of interpretation those whom John the Baptist and our Lord called "a brood of vipers," could not be those whom our Lord compared to chickens, and whom He desired to gather as a hen doth her brood!

John xiii. 1.

Ἀγαπήσας τοὺς ἰδίους τοὺς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ εἰς τέλος ἠγάπησεν αὐτούς.

Having loved His own which were in the world, He loved them unto the end.

From this some infer that where Christ has once loved He loves always or unto the end. And in support of this proposition they quote the prophet Malachi,[1] "For I am the Lord, I change not." The reference in the passage under consideration was evidently to the Apostles, and all in a general sense. It reveals the great and constant love of the Saviour to all who persevere in love and faithfulness to Him and are truly thus "His own." It is evident that it does not necessarily follow that if men draw back from Him, His love still continues to dwell on them, though in one sense even this is true, for God loves the *sinner*, while He

[1] Mal. iii. 6.

hates the *sin.* What was the doctrine declared by the man sent by God to meet King Asa and the people with Him? "O Asa, and all Judah and Benjamin, hear ye Me; the Lord is with you, while ye be with Him, and if ye seek Him, He will *be found* of you, but if *ye forsake Him,* He will forsake you"[1]

Probably the most correct rendering of the passage we are considering is not that Christ "Having loved His own, loved them unto the end" of their lives or days, but "to the end," *i.e.*, of His life in this world or to the uttermost—showing the great and constant love of our Lord to His disciples, even in the hour of their desertion and weakness. The passage offers no support to the doctrine of final perseverance, and can only be used as a declaration in favour of Christ's love towards His disciples. Neither can any support be obtained from the passage in Malachi; for this but asserts the unchangeableness of God in respect of His essence, attributes, and decrees, and not of any fixed course of action irrespective of the condition and mutability of the creature. Of course God is unchangeable in His essence and being, as David says in His address to Him, "Of old Thou hast laid the foundations of the earth, and the heavens are the works of Thy hands. They shall perish, but Thou shalt endure; yea all of them shall wax old like a garment, as a vesture shalt Thou change them and they shall be changed; but Thou art the same, and Thy years shall have no end."[2]

But to reason that because God is unchangeable in His Being and attributes, therefore if He loves a man to-day when he is obedient and walks in the path of righteousness, and hates him to-morrow when he wanders from that path and falls into grievous sin, there is a change in God is absurd. For the unchangeableness of the love of God does not stand in His constantly loving the same object materially considered, but only as considered formally, that is as remaining the same morally as he was when first loved. Saul, the persecutor of the Saints, and Paul the Apostle of the Lord were the same person materially considered, but in a formal consideration they were two and these very different. The truth is, that if God loved the same persons though morally distinguished from themselves in this way, it would argue a mutability in His affections.

John xv—1–2, 6.

Ἐγώ εἰμὶ ἡ ἄμπελος ἡ ἀληθινή, καὶ ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ γεωργός ἐστι. πᾶν κλῆμα ἐν ἐμοὶ μὴ φέρον καρπόν, αἴρει αὐτό· καὶ πᾶν τὸ καρπὸν φέρον, καθαίρει αὐτό, ἵνα πλείονα καρπὸν φέρῃ. . . . ἐὰν μή τις μείνῃ ἐν ἐμοί ἐβλήθη ἔξω ὡς τὸ κλῆμα, καὶ ἐξηράνθη· καὶ συνάγουσιν αὐτὰ καὶ εἰς τὸ πῦρ βάλλουσι, καὶ καίεται.

I am the true vine, and My Father is the husbandman. Every

[1] 2 Chron. xv. 2. [2] Psl. cii. 25.

branch in Me that beareth not fruit He taketh it away: and every branch that beareth fruit, He purgeth it, that it may bear more fruit. . . . If a man abide not in Me, he is cast forth as a branch, *and is withered; and they gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned.*

This is the teaching of our Lord Himself, and what can be clearer than that those who are in Christ, the Elect one—those who are in Him as the branches are in the vine—may become unfaithful, and be severed and cast away.

There is but one Vine into which the baptized can be grafted. They must be grafted by some act or they never could become branches of the vine, not being such by natural birth, and this act is baptism. The branches of a vine are connected with it in one of two ways. They either spring naturally from it, or are grafted into a stem to which they had not before belonged. As we are of the race of Adam we cannot be branches of the True Vine by natural birth or origin, for they are born "not of blood nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man but of God."[1] It is by baptism that we become grafted in the new parent stem—upon Him who is the beginning of the new creation of God. Taken from the wild stock, the stock of Adam, or corrupt tree, incapable of bringing forth fruit meet for repentance, we are grafted upon the True Vine, the tree of life, thereby receiving a regenerate life competent to bear the fruits of righteousness and true holiness here and fitted for transplanting into the Paradise of God hereafter. By this act of baptism we become branches of the One Vine, members of the body of Christ, and partakers of the Holy Ghost, and as such are exhorted to walk worthy of our high calling in Christ Jesus—a calling corresponding in dignity to the spiritual constitution of men who have been "begotten again to a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for us, who are kept by the power of God, through faith unto salvation, ready to be revealed in the last time."[2]

If, however, fruit is not brought forth, the branch will be cut away. We could hardly have a more powerful and distinct testimony than the passage under consideration affords against supralapsarian error, or clearer evidence that falling away from grace is possible. It is not said simply of the unfaithful branch which the Father takes away in judgment, but it speaks of one who will not abide in Christ and becomes separate from Him. Five steps or stages are mentioned—1st, the casting out; 2nd, the drying up, the fountain of life being severed; 3rd, the gathering up with other such by the angels at the last day; 4th, the casting into the fire as the result of the judgment; and 5th, the burning.

[1] John i. 13. [2] 1 Pet. i. 5.

Rom. xi. 20-22.

καλῶς· τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ ἐξεκλάσθησαν, σὺ δὲ τῇ πίστει ἕστηκας. μὴ ὑψηλοφρόνει, ἀλλὰ φοβοῦ· εἰ γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς τῶν κατὰ φύσιν κλάδων οὐκ ἐφείσατο, οὐδε σοῦ φείσεται. ἴδε οὖν χρηστότητα καὶ ἀποτομίαν Θεοῦ· ἐπὶ μὲν τοὺς πεσόντας ἀποτομία, ἐπὶ δὲ σε χρηστότης Θεοῦ, ἐὰν ἐπιμείνῃς τῇ χρηστότητι· ἐπεὶ καὶ σὺ ἐκκοπήσῃ.

Well, because of this unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by thy faith. Be not highminded but fear: for if God spared not the natural branches, neither will He spare thee. Behold then the goodness and severity of God; towards them which fell, severity; but towards thee God's goodness, if thou continue in His goodness: otherwise thou also shalt be cut off.

Calvin points out that the Apostle's address here is not so much to individuals as to the whole body of the Gentiles among whom there might have been many who were vainly inflated, professing rather than having faith, and with this we may agree, but when he goes on further to argue that it must have application exclusively to the Gentiles as a body "for the excision of which he (the Apostle) speaks could not apply to individuals whose election is unchangeable, based on the eternal purpose of God," we must decline to follow.

The language of the Apostle is clear, and its application to individuals as well as to the Gentiles as a body obvious.

1 Cor. iii. 17.

εἴ τις τὸν ναὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ φθείρει, φθερεῖ τοῦτον ὁ Θεός· ὁ γὰρ ναὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἅγιός ἐστὶν, οἵτινές ἐστε ὑμεῖς.

If any man destroyeth the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are.

1 Cor. ix. 27.

Ἀλλ' ὑπωπιάζω μου τὸ σῶμα καὶ δουλαγωγῶ, μήπως ἄλλοις κηρύξας αὐτὸς ἀδόκιμος γένωμαι.

But I buffet my body, and bring it into subjection: lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be rejected.

In this passage St. Paul, who evidently considered himself and styles himself (Eph. i. 4; Tit. i. 1) one of the Elect, refers to the possibility of his falling away, which would have been absurd if he had considered that election involved predestination to eternal life irreversibly. And it is impossible he could have considered himself a person destined by God from all eternity to everlasting punishment.

It may be objected that the word ἀδόκιμος generally translated a "castaway" does not always signify a person wholly rejected of God, but sometimes a person reprovable in some particular action.

But the word ἀδόκιμος is constantly rendered "reprobate" in the writings of the Apostle Paul—see Rom. i. 28; 2 Cor. xiii. 5–7; 2 Tim. iii. 8; Tit. i. 16. In Heb. vi. 8 it is rendered "rejected." "But if it beareth thorns and briars it is *rejected*, and is nigh unto cursing whose end is to be burned." St. Chrysostom considers it clear that the word in question relates to a person rejected from salvation by God. Commenting on this passage he thus paraphrases the meaning of the Apostle, "Do not think when once you have believed that it is sufficient to your salvation; for if it be not sufficient for me to salvation, to preach, to teach, to bring thousands unto God, unless I be unreprovable also in my personal ways and actions, much less will it be so unto you."[1]

2 Cor. vi. 1.

συνεργοῦντες δὲ καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν μὴ εἰς κενὸν τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ δέξασθαι ὑμᾶς.

We then, as workers together with Him, beseech also you that ye receive not the grace of God in vain. See 2 Cor. xi., 2–3; Col. i. 23; ii. 5–8.

Surely this exhortation would have been out of place had there been no fear of receiving the grace of God in vain, and falling away from Christ. Is it not implied that there is a fear that some who have actually received the grace of God may fall away and perish?

Gal. v. 4.

τῆς χάριτος ἐξεπέσατε.

Ye are fallen from grace.

1 Tim. i. 19.

Ἔχων πίστιν καὶ ἀγαθὴν συνείδησιν, ἣν τινες ἀπωσάμενοι περὶ τὴν πίστιν ἐναυάγησαν.

Holding faith and a good conscience; which some having thrust from themselves made shipwreck concerning the faith.

The faith of which some are said to have made shipwreck cannot be, as is asserted by some, a feigned or counterfeited faith, for it is such a faith as the Apostle exhorts Timothy to hold fast, "holding faith and a good conscience, which some having thrust from themselves, made shipwreck concerning the faith." The Apostle would not have exhorted Timothy to hold fast a faith which was merely counterfeited, and would have been rather gain than loss to have parted with. Besides the faith which Timothy is exhorted to hold fast must obviously be that faith which he was possessed of at that time, and that this was true faith no

[1] Μὴ γὰρ δὴ νομίσητέ, φησιν, ἐπειδὰν ἐπιστεύσατε, ὅτι ἀρκεῖ τοῦτο εἰς σωτηριαν ὑμῖν. Εἰ γὰρ ἐμοὶ τὸ κηρύξαι, τὸ διδάξαι, τὸ μυρίους προσαγαγεῖν οὐκ ἀρκεῖ εἰς σωτηρίαν, εἰ μὴ τὰ κατ' ἐμαυτὸν παρεχοίμην ἄληπτα, πολλῷ μᾶλλον ὑμῖν.

one can deny. "Having called to remembrance the *unfeigned faith* that is in thee, which dwelt first in thy grandmother Iris," are the words of St. Paul himself in his Second Epistle to Timothy.[1]

1 Tim. iv. 1.

τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα ῥητῶς λέγει, ὅτι ἐν ὑστέροις καιροῖς ἀποστήσονταί τινες τῆς πίστεως, προσέχοντες πνεύμασι πλάνοις καὶ διδασκαλίαις δαιμονίων.

Now the Spirit saith expressly, that in latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils.

1 Tim. v. 15.

ἤδη γάρ τινες ἐξετράπησαν ὀπίσω τοῦ Σατανᾶ.

For some are already turned aside after Satan.

Even Calvin in his Commentaries admits that the persons here said to have turned aside after Satan were before such turning aside the children of God and true believers, which is practically an admission by the champion of the impossibility of a total defection of the saints of the truth of the opposite doctrine. He says, referring to the words above, "This expression 'after Satan' is observable; because no man can turn aside from Christ, though it be ever so little, but he follows Satan. For he reigns over all who are not Christ's. Hence we are admonished how destructive a thing it is to turn aside from a straight course, which of the sons of God makes us slaves of the devil."[2]

Heb. ii. 3.

πῶς ἡμεῖς ἐκφευξόμεθα τηλικαύτης ἀμελήσαντες σωτηρίας;

How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation?

See Heb. iii. 6, 12, 14.

Heb. vi. 4-6.

ἀδύνατον γὰρ τοὺς ἅπαξ φωτισθέντας, γευσαμένους τε τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς ἐπουρανίου, καὶ μετόχους γενηθέντας Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, καὶ καλὸν γευσαμένους Θεοῦ ῥῆμα δυνάμεις τε μέλλοντος αἰῶνος, καὶ παραπεσόντας, πάλιν ἀνακαινίζειν εἰς μετάνοιαν, ἀνασταυροῦντας ἑαυτοῖς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ παραδειγματίζοντας.

For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, and then fell away, *to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put Him to an open shame.*

[1] 2 Tim. i. 5.

[2] Post Satanam; notanda loquutio, quia nemo potest vel tantillum à Christo deflectere, quin Satanam sequatur. Nam regnum in omnes habet, qui Christi non sunt. Hinc admonemur, quàm exitialis sit deflexus à recto cursu, quæ ex Dei filiis nos facit Satanæ mancipia.

Here the writer to the Hebrews shows in most solemn terms not only the possibility of falling away, but the impossibility in some cases of renewing unto repentance those who apostatize. The attempt to explain away the force of this passage, by asserting that the writer is here only imagining a case which has no existence, and can have none in reality, will not bear examination. Some stress is laid upon the word "if" in the Authorised Version.

The writer must be speaking of those who have actually been made partakers of the grace of God or his language would be meaningless. He mentions five points in which they were blessed, and had actually received grace. 1st, they had been *enlightened*, φωτισθέντας, spiritually enlightened to see the truths of the Gospel. The eyes of their understanding had been enlightened to see the great light which had sprung up to lighten the Gentiles and to be the glory of God's people Israel. They had received the good word of God and as sheep had hearkened to the voice of the Good Shepherd. They were so enlightened as to know they had an inheritance in heaven and a great recompense of reward, and that "they should inherit the promises if they cast not away their confidence," but continued faithful.

Having said that "the God of this world had blinded the eyes of those who believed not, lest the light of the glorious Gospel of Christ should shine in upon them," it is added, "For God who commanded light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God,"[1] so that true believers are in the passage under consideration distinguished from unbelievers by this, that they are "enlightened." A similar expression is used in the 10th chapter of this same Epistle, "But call to remembrance the former days, in which after ye were enlightened" φωτισθέντες, "ye endured a great fight of afflictions." And in writing to the Ephesians, the Apostle admonishes them to walk ὡς τέκνα φωτός "as children of the light."[2] (The use of the word in the passage under consideration no doubt gave rise to a meaning of φωτίζειν and φωτισμός, as denoting *baptism*, which was current throughout the Church prior to the Reformation.) *Secondly*, they had *tasted the heavenly gift*—the gift of God which is eternal life through Jesus Christ. They had been made partakers of that life, the life of the Risen Saviour, by being baptised into Him. "O *taste* and see that the Lord is good."[3] And St. Peter says, "If so be that ye have tasted that the Lord is gracious."[4] *Thirdly*, they had been made *partakers of the* Holy Ghost, by the laying on of hands, so that they had indeed become temples of the Holy Ghost, they had been anointed with the oil of gladness above their fellows. *Fourthly*, they had "*tasted the good word of God*," having fed on the Lamb of God, the Paschal Lamb, the Incarnate Word in the

[1] 2 Cor. iv. 6. [2] Eph. v. 8. [3] Psl. xxxiv. 8. [4] 1 Pet. ii. 3.

blessed sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ; and *Fifthly*, they had tasted δυνάμεις μέλλοντος αἰῶνος "*the powers of the world to come.*" They had known what it was to do the works of Christ in the body. They had been used as instruments by God. They had exercised the gifts of the Holy Ghost, which are truly the earnest of the powers of the world to come. There has been much difference of opinion as to what is meant by the phrase δυνάμεις μέλλοντος αἰῶνος. Some have thought those powerful foretastes of glory which are vouchsafed to the Elect even in this present condition. "But," says Dean Alford on this passage, "most commentators, and rightly, take αἰὼν μέλλων as equivalent to οἰκουμένη μέλλουσα (ch. ii. 5) and as designating the Christian times agreeably to that name of Christ in ref. Isa., πατὴρ τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος. Then the δυνάμεις of this "world to come" will be as in ch. ii. 4, where we have ποικίλαι δυνάμεις enumerated with σημείοις τε καὶ τέρασιν and πνεύματος ἁγίου μερισμοῖς, as God's testimonies to the Gospel. Thus they would mean the χαρίσματα, given by the Spirit in measure to all who believed, 'distributing severally to every man as He will.' We need not necessarily limit these to external miraculous powers, or even προφητεία, and the like; but surely may include in them spiritual powers bestowed in virtue of the indwelling Spirit to arm the Christian for his conflict with sin, the world, and the devil."

It is of persons who have been thus highly blessed, who have been thus made one with the Living Head in the heavens that the Apostle utters those solemn and awful words of warning, "It is impossible for those who fell away, to renew them again to repentance, seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh and put Him to an open shame"; in other words, they again declare Him worthy of that punishment they had inflicted on Him, and so to them there "remained no more a sacrifice for sin, but a fearful expectation of judgment."[1] There is nothing for them to turn to—nothing can be proposed to their faith, but what they have rejected. Having been suns of the morning, and having shone with lustre and brightness in the firmament of Heaven, they have fallen with Satan like lightning from Heaven.[2] "He that hath set at nought Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses; of how much sorer punishment suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith He was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of Grace."[3]

Heb. x. 38.

ὁ δὲ δίκαιός μου ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται· καὶ ἐὰν ὑποστείληται, οὐκ εὐδοκεῖ ἡ ψυχή μου ἐν αὐτῷ.

[1] Heb. x. 26, 27. [2] Luke x. 18.
[3] Heb. x.

But My just one shall live by faith; but if he draw back, *My soul hath no pleasure in him.*

The word ὑποστέλλεσθαι signifies to draw back, refuse, shrink, and fly from a thing, and so the object of it being here faith, must signify the drawing back of the person spoken of from faith, and so must be his drawing back into perdition. It is clear that the ἐὰν ὑποστείληται, if he draw back refers to the "just man" who lives by faith. The words therefore plainly suppose that the just man who lives by faith may draw back to perdition. The translators of our authorised version have not expressed the true force of the original, for they have substituted "any man" for "the just man."

The meaning is clear that if the just man, or righteous one, who lives and should live always by faith shall draw or shrink back, he will cease to be a pleasure to his Lord. Hence it is evident that a just or a righteous man may draw back and fall from grace. Could we conceive it possible for the Holy Ghost to declare that the Lord would have no pleasure in the just man who lived by faith upon his drawing back, were there no danger or possibility of his doing so,—that is, that He should declare what the sentiments of the Lord would be in regard to circumstances which by no possibility could arise?

Heb. xii. 14, 15.

Εἰρήνην διώκετε μετὰ πάντων, καὶ τὸν ἁγιασμὸν οὗ χωρὶς οὐδεὶς ὄψεται τὸν Κύριον· ἐπισκοποῦντες μή τις ὑστερῶν ἀπὸ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Θεοῦ.

Follow peace with all men, and the sanctification without which no man shall see the Lord: looking diligently lest there be any man that faileth of the grace of God.

2 Pet. i. 10.

Διὸ μᾶλλον, ἀδελφοί, σπουδάσατε βεβαίαν ὑμῶν τὴν κλῆσιν καὶ ἐκλογὴν ποιεῖσθαι· ταῦτα γὰρ ποιοῦντες οὐ μὴ πταίσητέ ποτε.

Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure; for if ye do these things ye shall never fall.

In this passage St. Peter exhorts all the brethren to make their calling and election sure, which certainly implies the possibility of their not doing so, and so falling away. If there had been no possibility of falling, such an admonition would have been useless. The Apostle shows most clearly that our continuance in the grace of God can only be maintained by doing His will.

2 Pet. ii. 20.

Εἰ γὰρ ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιάσματα τοῦ κόσμου ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τούτοις δὲ πάλιν ἐμπλακέντες ἡττῶνται, γέγονεν αὐτοῖς τὰ ἔσχατα χείρονα τῶν πρώτων.

For if after they have escaped the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, they are again entangled therein, and overcome, the last state is worse with them than the first.

The possibility of a total and final defection of the saints certainly seems here to be pointed to. Those who have escaped the pollutions of the world may again become entangled therewith and may be overcome, so that their last condition shall be worse than the first. It must be remembered that the persons to whom the Apostle is addressing himself in this Epistle are those "partakers of like precious faith" with himself and the rest of the Apostles,[1] and it is not likely he would warn those to whom he writes of what could never befal them, but only those to whom he was not writing. If there were no possibility of his readers making their "last state worse than their first," the warning and exhortation were in vain and meaningless.

2 Pet. iii. 17.

ὑμεῖς οὖν, ἀγαπητοί, προγινώσκοντες φυλάσσεσθε, ἵνα μὴ τῇ τῶν ἀθέσμων πλάνῃ συναπαχθέντες ἐκπέσητε τοῦ ἰδίου στηριγμοῦ.

Ye therefore, beloved, knowing these things before, beware lest ye, being led away with the error of the wicked, fall *from your own stedfastness.*

Here the Apostle shows that there was a danger lest those "who had obtained like precious faith"[2] with himself, those to whom "divine power had given all things that pertain unto life and godliness"[3] might be "led away into the error of the wicked" and might "fall from their own stedfastness."

Rev. iii. 5.

ὁ νικῶν οὕτως περιβαλεῖται ἐν ἱματίοις λευκοῖς· καὶ οὐ μὴ ἐξαλείψω τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῆς βίβλου τῆς Ζωῆς, καὶ ὁμολογήσω το ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐνώπιον τοῦ πατρός μου καὶ ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ.

He that overcometh shall thus be clothed in white raiment; and I will not blot out his name out of the book of life, and I will confess his name before my Father, and before His angels.

The promise not to blot out the names of such as have not defiled their garments, implies certainly that the names of those who have defiled their garments, who are unfaithful and disobedient, shall be blotted out.

Rev. iii. 10–11.

ὅτι ἐτήρησας τὸν λόγον τῆς ὑπομονῆς μου, κἀγώ σε τηρήσω ἐκ τῆς ὥρας τοῦ πειρασμοῦ τῆς μελλούσης ἔρχεσθαι ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκουμένης ὅλης, πειράσαι τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. ἔρχομαι ταχύ· κράτει ὅ ἔχεις, ἵνα μηδεὶς λάβῃ τὸν στέφανόν σου.

[1] 2 Pet. i. 3. [2] 2 Pet. i. 1. [3] 2 Pet. i. 3

Because thou didst keep the word of My patience, I also will keep thee from the hour of Temptation, which shall come upon all the world, to try them that dwell upon the earth. I come quickly; hold that fast which thou hast, that no man take thy crown.

Rev. xxii. 19.

ἐάν τις ἀφέλῃ ἀπὸ τῶν λόγων τοῦ βιβλίου τῆς προφητείας ταύτης, ἀφελεῖ ὁ Θεὸς τὸ μέρος αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς, καὶ ἐκ τῆς πόλεως τῆς ἁγίας, τῶν γεγραμμένων ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ.

If any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part from the tree of life, and out of the holy city, which are written in this book.

This shows that even though the name be enrolled in the book of life—the register of the Elect, yet the same may be blotted out by the judgment of God.

(d) Testimony of the Early Church.

Vossius, in his Pelagian history, asserts most distinctly that Augustine, Prosper and Pelagius, with his followers, agree in this, that justifying faith and regenerating grace may be lost, and that they are lost by very many. And the same writer adds, "Therefore they understand not the doctrine or judgment of antiquity, who when they read in Augustine and others that the Elect of God either never fall away, or else that they return to God before they die, from hence infer that their opinion was, that true believers either always persevere in faith, or at least never fall away utterly from the grace of God. Whose arguing leans upon this supposition, that true believers and the elect are terms convertible; whereas, according to Augustine's doctrine, not true believers, but true believers persevering and Elect are reciprocable. Yea, the whole dispute which Augustine had with Pelagius and the Massilians about the perseverance of the saints stands upon a contrary hypothesis. For unless it be granted that some true believers and godly ones do depart (from God) and not return, do fall and not rise again, this question, why some of these persevere, others not, is at an end before it begin; and yet this was the question so hotly disputed between Augustine and his adversaries. Yea, the truth is, that all antiquity jointly opposes that indefectibility (of the saints which some defend). Nor is there any among the ancients to be found who, as far as I am able to call to mind, conceives that believers have any absolute certainty of their perseverance. They indeed acknowledge that the minds of the children of God ought not to be tortured with any anxiety of doubting, inasmuch as they have a confidence of hope, which may sustain and keep up with sufficient comfort those that may fall, and relieve those that are already fallen. But yet they deny that any man, because he certainly knows that he

is at present in the number of true believers, can therefore promise unto himself, with any degree of certainty, such and so much favour from God for the remaining part of his life, that he may be as bold as if he had if by revelation from God that he shall never incur the guilt of adultery, murder, idolatry, though David, Solomon, and others, declined so fearfully from the ways of God as they did; or in case he shall fall into such horrible sins with them, that he also shall have the time of his life prolonged as David had, until, upon his serious repentance, he be reconciled unto God. Such an absolute certainty as this they affirm to be inexpedient in this life, being obnoxious to so many temptations, and where the weakness of men is such that unless there be a continual solicitude and care to keep that grace which we have once received, a carnal security will most easily steal upon us, through which, as by a broad gate wide open, whole troops of vices are likely to convey themselves into us."[1]

Though it is true many object to the interpretation of antiquity here given, yet Vossius is not far from the truth. There is some confusion in the Fathers by reason of some of them drawing a distinction between different degrees of faith; and this has been well pointed out by Vossius in the following words, "This nevertheless is to be taken into special consideration that when the Fathers affirm that faith may be lost, and therefore that eternal election cannot rightly be inferred from faith, they do not all speak of any measure or degree of faith whatsoever, since many of them distinguish three several degrees of faith. The first of which gives essence or truth of being unto faith in respect whereof it justifies and is called a lively faith: opposite to this is a dead and putrid, such as that of hypocrites. The next degree adds duration (perseverance) in respect whereof it saves: opposite to this faith is that which we commonly call temporary (attributing that improperly unto men's faith which the Scripture attributes to men themselves), which is the faith of apostates. The third degree superadds solidity: this faith is termed perfect, solid, rooted, which any time of a man's life gives him assurance; *i.e.*, to use the words of Gregory the Great, does so confirm that a man cannot fall afterwards, and knows this most certainly of himself. To this degree of faith a weak faith is opposed, which is the faith of many of the elect. Those passages of the Fathers wherein they say that true faith may be lost but is always recovered again, always speak of the second degree of faith. But those, where they say that such faith cannot be lost, must necessarily be understood of the third and highest degree of faith. Between which expressions and what they generally teach otherwise, viz., that many perish eternally through a falling away from their faith, there is no repugnance. For in such assertion as this, they understand faith of the first

[1] Vossius Hist. Pelag. lib. vi. Thes. 12.

degree, *i.e.* such a faith which is formally and essentially true, or, which is the same, which is justifying, though not saving, but justifying in the essence or substance of it, in respect whereof a man is at present righteous or just: not justifying in respect of continuance; since if we consider the truth of the end, that faith is not truly justifying, which at any time ceases to justify: because no other faith has the promise of eternal life, but only that which perseveres.[1]

Clement of Rome.

Remember the words of our Lord Jesus: for He has said, Woe to that man; it were good for him rather not to have been born, than that he should cause one of *my elect* people to stumble.[2]

Barnabas.

Take heed, therefore, lest sitting still, now that we are called, we fall asleep in our sins, and the wicked one getting the dominion over us, stir us up, and shut us out of the kingdom of the Lord.[3]

Beware, therefore, lest haply we discover, as it is written, many are called, but few chosen.[4]

Hermas.

Behold the mighty Lord, who by His invisible power and with His excellent wisdom made the world, and by His glorious counsel beautified His creature, and with His most mighty word fixed the heaven and founded the earth upon the waters: and by His powerful might established His Holy Church, which He hath blessed. Behold He will remove the heavens and the mountains, the hills and the seas; and all things shall be made smooth *for His elect;* that He may fulfil to them the promise which He hath promised, with much honour and joy, *if so be* that they shall keep the statutes of God which they have received in great faith.[5]

For the mighty Lord hath sworn by His glory concerning His Elect after that he had aforetime appointed that day that *if any one shall still sin, he shall not have salvation.*[6]

[1] Voss. Hist. Pelag. lib. vi. Thes. 13.

[2] Μνήσθητε τῶν λόγων Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν, εἶπε γάρ· "Οὐαὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ, καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη, ἢ ἕνα τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν μου σκανδαλίσαι· κρεῖττον ἦν αὐτῷ περιτεθῆναι μύλου, καὶ καταποντισθῆναι εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, ἢ ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν μου σκανδαλίσαι." Epist. ad Corinth. § 46.

[3] Adtendite, ne quando quiescentes jam vocati addormiamus in peccatis nostris; et nequam, accipiens potestatem nostram, suscitet et excludat à regno Domini. Barn. Epis. § iv.

[4] Adtendamus ergo, ne forte, sicut scriptum est, *multi vocati, pauci electi,* inveniamur. Ib.

[5] Ecce Deus virtutem, qui invisibili virtute, et magno sensu suo condidit mundum, et honorifico consilio circumdedit decorem creaturæ suæ et fortissimo suo verbo confixit cælum, et fundavit terram super aquas, et virtute suâ potenti condidit sanctam Ecclesiam suam, quam benedixit; ecce transferet cælos ac montes, colles ac maria; et omnia plana fient electis ejus; ut reddat illis repromissionem quam repromisit, cum multo honore et gaudio si servaverint legitima Dei, quæ acceperunt in magna fide. Herm. Vis. i. § 3.

[6] Juravit enim Dominator ille per gloriam suam super electos suos, præfinita istâ die; etiam nunc si peccaverit aliquis, non habiturum illum salutem. Ib. Vis. ii. § 2.

Beware, my sons, lest peradventure then your dissensions should *defraud you of your life.* How will you instruct *the elect of God,* seeing that ye yourselves have no discipline ?[1]

Go and relate to *the elect of God,* His mighty deeds. . . Woe to those doubtful ones, who shall hear these words and despise them ! It were better for them never to be born.[2]

TERTULLIAN.

Some are of opinion as if God must of necessity give that which He has promised, even to those that are unworthy, and thus make His bounty a servitude or bondage. But if He gratifies us with the symbol of death out of necessity, He does it against His will. And who will suffer that to continue or remain firm which He gives unwillingly ? *For, do not many afterwards fall away ?* Is not this gift taken away from many ?[3]

CYPRIAN.

If forsaking the Church when he has been a confessor, and thus rending asunder the concord of unity, any person shall have exchanged his first faith for later perfidy; he cannot merely by reason of his confession flatter himself *as if he were elected to the reward of glory,* since from this very conduct the deservedness of his punishment is only increased. For the Lord elected Judas also among the Apostles, *and yet Judas afterwards betrayed the Lord.*[4]

Notwithstanding Peter, upon whom the Church was built by the same Lord, speaking once for all, and answering in the Church's voice, says, "Lord, to whom shall we go ? Thou hast the words of eternal life": and we believe and know that Thou art the Son of the living God; signifying and showing that those who depart from Christ perish through their own fault, but the Church which believes in Christ, and which holds that which it has once known, never departs from Him at all; and they are the Church who abide in the house of God.[5]

[1] Videte ergo filii, ne forte hæ dissentiones vestræ fraudent vitam vestram. Quo modo vos erudire vultis electos Dei, cum ipsi non habeatis disciplinam ? Ib. Vis. iii. § 9.

[2] Vade ergo, et enarra electis Dei magnalia ipsius.....Væ dubiis iis, qui audierint verba hæc, et contempserint ! Melius erat illis non nasci. Ib. Vis. iv. § 2.

[3] Quidam autem opinatur, quasi Deus necesse habeat præstare etiam indignis, quod spospondit; et liberalitatem ejus faciunt servitutem Quod si necessitate nobis symbolum mortis indulget, ergo invitus facit. Quis enim permittit permansurum id, quod tribuerit invitus ? Non enim multi postea excidunt ? Non à multis donum illud aufertur ? Tert. *de Pœnitentia* cap. vi.

[4] Si Ecclesiam denique, ubi confessor factus est, derelinquens, et unitatis concordiam scindens, fidem primam perfidia posteriore mutaverit, blandiri sibi per confessionem non potest, quasi sit electus ad gloriæ præmium ; quando ex hoc ipso magis creverint merita pœnarum : nam et Judam inter Apostolos Dominus elegit ; et tamen Dominum Judas post modum tradidit. Cyprian, *de unit Eccles.*

[5] Petrus tamen, super quem ædificata ab eodem Domino fuerat Ecclesia, unus pro omnibus loquens, et Ecclesiæ voce respondens, ait : Domine ad quem ibimus ? verba vitæ æternæ habes, et nos credimus et cognovimus, quoniam tu est filius Dei vivi : Significans scilicet et ostendens, eos qui à Christo recesserint, culpa sua perire : Ecclesiam tamen quæ in Christum credat, et quæ semel id quod cognoverit teneat, nunquam ab eo omnino discedere ; et eos esse Ecclesiam, qui in domo Dei permanent. Cyprian, *Ep.* lxix. *ad Cornel.*

Basil.

Many who had gathered much together from their youth, when they came to the middle of their years, temptations from evil spirits rising up against them and assaulting them, have not been able to bear the burden of the winter for want of a good pilot ship, and so have *lost all.* And hence it comes to pass that *some have made shipwreck of faith;* others, by means of a violent tempest, as it were, of pleasure rushing upon them, have utterly lost that chastity which they had preserved together from their youth. A most sad spectacle! for a man after fasting, after austereness of living, after much praying, after much weeping, after a continent life, it may be for twenty or thirty years together, through negligence and carelessness of soul, to be found destitute of all: and that such a person who hath greatly prospered by the work of the commandments (of God) should become like unto a merchant of a great estate, who, whilst his ship sailed on her course with a fair and prosperous wind, judged himself a brave man for the abundance of goods in her, but having passed through tempestuous seas, his vessel comes to be wrecked in the very haven, and he pointed at or shown by men as one that on the sudden and at once hath lost all.[1]

But sin is the destroyer of that grace which is given us by the laver of regeneration.[2]

Jerome.

(For) Nothing is lost except what was before safe, and nothing dies except what was before alive. Therefore, those who are now called the sons of perdition, or of iniquity and of wickedness, have *through their own fault forsaken the Lord*, and from the sons of the Lord have begun to be the sons of perdition: this same Prophet (Isaiah) saying, "You have forsaken the Lord, you have provoked the Holy One of Israel unto anger." (Is. i. 4.)[1]

Augustine.

It is much to be wondered at, and greatly to be wondered at, that

[1] Πολλοὶ γὰρ πολλὰ συναθροίσαντες ἐκ νεότητος, περὶ τὰ μέσα τοῦ βίου γενόμενοι, ἐπαναστάντων αὐτοῖς πειρασμῶν ἐκ τῶν πνευμάτων τῆς πονηρίας, οὐκ ἤνεγκαν τοῦ χειμῶνος τὸ βάρος διὰ τὸ τὴν κυβέρνησιν αὐτοῖς μὴ παρεῖναι· ἀλλὰ πάντων ἐκείνων τὴν ζημίαν ὑπέμειναν. Ὅθεν καὶ οἱ μὲν τὴν πίστιν ἐναυάγησαν, ἄλλοι δὲ σωφροσύνην ἣν συνήγαγον ἐκ νεότητος, ὥσπερ καταιγίδος τινὸς τῆς πονηρᾶς ἡδονῆς ἐπιδραμούσης, ἀπώλεσαν. Ἐλεεινότατον θέαμα· μετὰ νηστείαν, μετὰ σκληραγωγίαν, μετὰ προσευχὴν ἐκτενῆ, μετὰ δάκρυον δαψιλὲς, μετὰ ἐγκράτειαν ἐτῶν εἴκοσι που, ἢ τρίακοντα, διὰ ἀπροσεξίαν ψυχῆς καὶ ἀμέλειαν, γυμνὸν ἁπάντων ἀποδειχθῆναι· καὶ παραπλήσιον γενέσθαι τὸν τῇ ἐργασίᾳ τῶν ἐντολῶν εὐθηνούμενον, ἐμπόρῳ τινὶ μεγαλοπλούτῳ, ὃς τῷ πλήθει τῶν ἀγωγίμων ἐπαγαλλόμενος, ἐξουρίας αὐτῷ τῆς νηὸς φερομένης, τὰ φοβερὰ πελάγη διαδραμὼν, πρὸς αὐτοῖς τοῖς λιμέσι διαῤῥαγέντος τοῦ πλοίου, πάντων ἀθρόως ἔρημος ἀπεδείχθη. Basil Hom. xii. in Princip. Proverb. (*prope finem*).

[2] Ἡ δὲ ἁμαρτία ἀφανιστικὴ τῆς χάριτος, τῆς δεδομένης ἡμῖν διὰ τοῦ λούτρου τῆς παλιγγενεσίας. *Ib.* Hom. xxi. (*circa finem*).

[1] Nunquam enim perit, nisi quod prius salvum fuit; et nunquam moritur, nisi quod antè vixerat. Ergo isti qui nunc appellantur filii perditionis, sive iniquitatis, ac sceleris, proprio vitio dereliquerunt Dominum, et de filiis Domini, filii perditionis esse cœperunt, dicente ad eos hoc eodem Propheta: *Dereliquistis Dominum, et ad iracundiam provocastis Sanctum Israel.* Hier. *In Isa. Proph*,. lib. xvi., cap. 57.

God, to some of His children whom He has regenerated in Christ, and to whom He has given faith, hope, and love, *should not give perseverance also;* when He forgives such great sins unto strange children, and by imparting His grace unto them, makes them His own children.[1]

That of two both being godly, why perseverance unto the end should be given unto the one and *not given unto the other* belongs to the unsearchable judgment of God.[2]

That of regenerate men, some die persevering unto the end; others are detained in life *until they fall away,* who certainly had not fallen away had they died before they so fell; and, again, some falling but not departing from this life until they rise again, who certainly would have perished had they died before their return.[3]

[1] Mirandum est quidem, multumque mirandum, quod filiis suis Deus quibusdam quos regeneravit in Christo, quibus fidem, spem, dilectionem dedit, non dat perseverantiam, cum filiis alienis scelera tanta dimittat, atque impertitâ gratiâ suâ, faciat filios suos. August. *de Correpl et Grat.* cap. xviii. [viii].

[2] Ex duobus autem piis, cur huic donetur perseverantia usque in finem, illi autem non donetur; inscrutabiliora sunt judicia Dei. Ib. *de Dono Persev.* cap. xxi. [viii].

[3] Ipsos quoque regeneratos, alios perseverantes usque in finem, hinc abire: alios quousque decidant, hic teneri, qui utique non decidissent, si antequam laberentur hinc issent: et rursus, quosdam lapsos, quousque redeant, non exire de hac vitâ: qui utique perirent, si antequam redirent, exirent. *Ibid.* cap. xxxii. [xiii].

Chapter VII.

BRIEF NOTICES OF OTHER SCHEMES OF ELECTION.

(a) *Arminianism.*

We propose now to consider more particularly the doctrine enunciated by Arminius and usually held by his followers, and in setting forth his views to give them as nearly as possible in his own words gathered from his various writings.

It is not unfrequently asserted that Arminius assigned the cause of election to be God's eternal prevision of the future persevering holiness and consequently moral fitness of the individuals themselves, who by reason whereof have been thus elected. It is apprehended that, however common this assertion may be—an assertion sanctioned by Mr. Faber in his excellent "Enquiry into the Primitive Doctrine of Election," it is not an accurate statement of the doctrine as taught by Arminius, neither is it a fair deduction from what he did teach.[1] It is true that he considered the *cause of reprobation* to be God's eternal foresight of the future impenitence and unbelief of the individuals themselves, who thence have been reprobated; but it does not follow that holiness or peculiar fitness was therefore, according to him, the cause of election. He most certainly bases the one on *mercy* and the other on *justice* alone.

Arminius defines Predestination as the decree of the good pleasure of God in Christ by which He resolved within Himself from all eternity to justify, adopt, and endow with everlasting life to the praise of His own glorious grace, believers on whom He had decreed to bestow faith. The cause of this decree of God is "the good pleasure or the benevolent affection of His own will." This good pleasure, he considered, not only excludes every cause which it could take from man, or which it could be imagined to take from him, but it likewise removes whatever is in or from man that could justly move God not to make that gracious decree.

As the foundation of this Decree he places Jesus Christ the Mediator between God and man, who is constituted by God the

[1] Mr. Faber's idea is that Arminianism has rejected both the *Ideality* and the *Causation* of Election, as that doctrine was understood by the strictly Primitive Church. Calvinism, on the other hand, he considered, had retained the *Causation*, but rejected the *Ideality*. Thus, of the two systems, he thought Arminianism had the more widely departed from aboriginal Christian antiquity, for in truth it had altogether forsaken it. Mr. Faber has somewhat misunderstood the views of Arminius.

Head of all those persons who will by Divine Predestination accept of the equal enjoyment of these blessings. Eternity is attributed to this decree, because God does nothing in time which He has not decreed to do from all eternity.

Arminius divides the object of Predestination into two parts—one regarding the divine things, the other the persons to whom the communication of these divine things has been predestinated by the Decree:—1st, among the divine things are classed Justification, adoption of sons, and the Spirit of grace—all three in this present life—hereafter, eternal life. This usually receives the appellation of grace and glory. 2nd, persons limited to believers, which presupposes sin; for no one believes in Christ except a sinner, and the man who acknowledges himself to be a sinner. Our author explains that by "believers" he means not those who would be such by their own merits or strength, but those who by the peculiar mercy of God believe in Christ.

We have already seen that there are various opinions as to whether the Decree of Predestination contemplated man as a sinner or not. Some suppose that the object, or more accurately subject, of predestination generally is man *as a sinner and fallen in Adam*; others lay it down to be man considered as *created and placed "in puris naturalibus."* Others again consider the subject to be man *to be created*, while some express it as *man as salvable and damnable, as capable of being created and of falling.* Others again assign the subject to be man considered in *common and absolutely*, while some suppose the subject must be considered *entirely in common*, man as yet to be created, as created, and as fallen.

It was one of the great points of contention between Arminius and his predecessor in the Divinity chair at Leyden as to whether the decree of election was made in regard to man in the integrity of his nature or as fallen. Junius held the former and Arminius the latter. The former contended that God regarded man generally from eternity in both election and reprobation, and consequently both before he was created and when, of course, he had not fallen; that God regarded man simply in every relationship; and in the case of damnation He regarded the sinner whom He did not give to Christ by the election of grace and whom He from eternity saw to be a sinner, and that in whatever condition man was regarded, he was elected or reprobated without consideration of well doing or of sin. His argument run in this way; Before Adam and Eve had been created and had done any good or evil, God's election had already existed according to the purpose of grace, His election having preceded both persons and all causes arising from persons. In support of this he cites Rom. ix. and Eph. i., and argues this must have been the case, for first election was made in Christ, not in the creature, or by any condition, or

on account of any condition of them; and secondly, because predestination and reprobation suppose nothing in the predestinated or reprobated but solely the predestination as the Apostle affirms, Rom. ix. 11, "Not by works, but of Him that calleth." He concludes then that God had regard to man *in general*, that He did not find the cause in man, because the cause of that adoption (υἱοθεσίας) or begetting of children (τεκτογονίας) takes its rise from His own sole will and favour, meeting the objection that sin is the cause of preterition or reprobation by stating that since all men are equally sinners in the sight of God, one thing must have happened respecting these three,—either that all are rejected on account of sin, as from a common cause; or that sin is pardoned to all; or that the cause is fixed elsewhere in sin. Finally he adds; who can make us to differ unless it be God according to the purpose of His election, and, if so, it is clear that in the matter of election and reprobation made from eternity God must have considered man in general.

To this Arminius's reply is that Adam and all in him were created in supernatural grace; that in their first state they had not mere nature but also supernatural grace, whether from the act of creation or from that of superinfusion. Whence he concludes that men could not have been considered "*in puris naturalibus*" by God when predestinating and passing by or reprobating; that Adam had the faculty of performing the law which God had appointed, and that the Creator was prepared to give "what was required, besides this faculty for actual obedience, namely to will, and to do, if Adam had not voluntarily and of his own free will turned away from God and His grace." That God foresaw from eternity what was to take place, and freely arranged concerning the future by ordination to that end according to His own will and pleasure, compelled by no necessity. He specifically meets the objection urged by Junius by admitting that sin is not the cause for which God elects some, asserting, however, that sin is the cause why God pretermits or reprobates others. Though sin, he admits, may not have moved God to predestinate (for it is the proper effect of sin to deserve the wrath of God), yet he contends that predestination was not made except by occasion of sin which God from eternity foresaw by reason of the infinity of His knowledge would occur in time. This is certainly agreeable to what St. Augustine says: "Deus alios facit vasa iræ secundum meritum; alios vasa misericordiæ secundum gratiam." And in another place, "Deus ex eadem massa damnata originaliter, tanquam figulus, fecit aliud vas ad honorem, aliud in contumeliam." Arminius in his reply to Junius argues further to this effect: Christ is the Head; we are the members. He was predestinated to be the Head prior in order to our predestination to be His members. He was first ordained Mediator; we

then were ordained in Him to be saved on account of Him and unto Him. Christ is the ordained Mediator between God and *sinful man,* not between God and man simply; and if Christ is the Mediator of sinners, then it follows that no one can be loved in Christ the Mediator except a sinner. No one, therefore, is predestinated in Christ except a sinner. Non-sinners do not stand in need of a Reconciler, or Redeemer, or a Mediator. His argument in syllogistic form is thus: Whoever have been elected in Christ as Mediator between God and sinful men, that is, as Reconciler and Redeemer, have been considered as sinners by God when electing: But all men who have been elected in Christ have been elected in Christ as Mediator between God and sinful man, that is as Reconciler and Redeemer: Therefore all men who have been elected in Christ have been considered as sinners by God when electing.

Arminius considered that the Decree concerning creation was the first of all the decrees of God, making four decrees respecting the salvation of sinful men.

The *first* is that by which God resolves to appoint His son Jesus Christ as a Saviour, Redeemer, High Priest, and One who may expiate sins by the merits of his own obedience, may recover lost salvation and dispense it by His efficacy.

The *second* decree is that by which God resolves to receive into favour those who repent and believe, and to save in Christ on account of Christ and through Christ those who persevere: but to leave under sin and wrath those who are impenitent and unbelievers, and to condemn them as aliens from Christ.

The *third* decree is that by which God resolves to administer such means for repentance and faith as are necessary, sufficient, and efficacious. And this administration is directed according to the wisdom of God, by which He knows what is suitable or becoming to mercy and severity; it is also according to His righteousness, by which He is prepared to follow and execute the directions of His wisdom.

The *fourth* decree concerns the salvation of *some* particular persons, and the damnation of *others.* This rests or depends on the prescience or foresight of God, by which He foreknew from all eternity what men would through such administrations believe by the aid of *preventing* grace, and would persevere by the aid of *subsequent* grace, and who would not believe and persevere.

Arminius denies what the extreme Calvinist holds, that creation in an upright state of original righteousness was a way of reprobation, and asserts the opposite, viz., that it was the surest token of God's benevolence and love towards those whom He created such. For creation, as he puts it, is a communication of good according to the intrinsic property of its nature. But a creation with intent to pave a way to reprobation which had been pre-

viously determined could not be a communication of good. Reprobation proceeds from hatred, but not so creation; the latter, therefore, is not a way or means belonging to the execution of the decree of reprobation. That creation was not a way of reprobation he shows first from God's *wisdom*, it being the height of folly to create in order to damn, and to create some only for the purpose of being able to damn them; and, secondly, from His infinite *goodness*. He points out that the first action of the supreme God towards any object cannot have evil for its object, but reprobation is evil; therefore God's first action towards an object cannot be reprobation. Thirdly, he shows this from His *justice*. It would be unjust to reprobate, he argues, what is not wicked; for as what is good is the proper object of approbation, so what is wicked is the proper object of reprobation; but what is not created cannot be wicked, therefore it would be unjust to reprobate what is not created; consequently God does not reprobate the non-created, and on that account creation is not a way of reprobation.

He considered with the more learned of the schoolmen that predestination rests upon the prevision of the fall. He placed the *form* of this predestination in the internal act itself of God, who foreordains to believers union with Christ their Head, and a participation in His benefits, and the *end* in "the praise of the glory of the grace of God." And as this grace is the cause of that decree, it is equitable that it should be celebrated by glory—though God, by using it, has rendered it illustrious and glorious.

As to reprobation, after stating that the decree of Predestination is according to election, Arminius admits that this election necessarily infers reprobation, which is "a casting away,"[1] "an ordination to condemnation,"[2] and "an appointment unto wrath,"[3] and he defines it to be a Decree of the Wrath, or of the Severe Will of God, by which He resolves from all eternity to condemn to eternal death all unbelievers and impenitent persons, for the declaration of His Wrath and Power, yet so that unbelievers are visited with this punishment not only on account of unbelief, but likewise on account of other sins from which they might have been delivered through faith.

He well exposes Calvin's impeachment of God's justice, or His right to condemn men for His own glory in the following terms: "Let us grant that these creatures (reprobates) were already created, or at least were considered as created: I deny that God, because He has a right of dominion over them, can rightfully destine them to destruction unless He considers them as sinners, and they are truly sinners in God's foreknowledge. For God's dominion over the creatures is not so infinite that He can *rightfully* do with them whatever His infinite and absolute power *could* do with them. For every right of God over a creature rests

[1] Rom. xi. 1. [2] Jude 4. [3] 1 Thess. v. 9.

either upon God's benefaction towards it, or on its ill-doing towards God, or lastly on a contract. But the right of destining to destruction, which we are here discussing, does not rest on man's ill-doing, nor is according to contract; therefore it rests on God's benefaction. But He does not, from benefit conferred, derive the right of inflicting evil, or of decreeing or willing to inflict on a man an evil which exceeds the benefit conferred. But eternal death and misery far exceed that good which God has communicated to the creature by the action of creation; for Christ says, It would have been better for that man if he had not been born.[4] Therefore eternal damnation or eternal death is a greater evil than this life, to which man is born and has been first created, is a good. For that evil is the highest of all evils; and this good is not the highest of all good things. Creation, too, is the communication of finite good; but this destination to evil is infinite in its gravity; that is, it is as great as can be inflicted on a creature by God's infinite omnipotence. If anyone affirm that God can do that because He has also conferred an infinite good on man, as when He created him to be immortal as to his soul, I answer that this evil is aggravated by this very thing, that it is not only intolerable in its gravity, but also endless in its duration."

On the subject of the predestination of means to the end, our author defines this as the eternal decree of God by which He has wisely and justly resolved within Himself to administer those means which are necessary and sufficient to produce faith in the hearts of sinful men, in such a manner as He knows to be comportable with His mercy and with His severity, to the glory of His name and to the salvation of believers. The *object* of this predestination, he asserts, is both the means of producing this faith, and the sinful men to whom God has decreed either to give or not to give this faith; as the object of predestination generally is faith itself existing in the preconception of the mind of God. The antecedent or duly-moving *cause* impelling to make the decree, he places not in the mercy of God alone but also in His severity. His wisdom, however, prescribes the mode which His justice administers. The *matter* he considers is the conceded or the denied dispensation of the means, and the *form* the ordained dispensation itself according to which it is granted to some men and denied to others, or it is granted or denied on *this* and not on *that* condition. The *end* is the declaration of the mercy of God and of His severity, wisdom, and justice; and the *result* the condemnation of unbelievers, and the still more grievous condemnation of some men. He distinctly asserts that God destines means to no persons on account of or according to their own merits, but through mere grace alone, and that he denies them to no one except justly on account of previous trangressions.

[4] Matt. xxvi. 24.

Respecting the fall of Adam, Arminius taught that Adam was able to continue in goodness, and to refrain from sinning; that Adam sinned freely and voluntarily, without any necessity, either internal or external, and that he did not fall through the decree of God, neither through being ordained to fall nor through desertion, but through the mere permission of God, which Arminius places in subordination to neither predestination, to salvation, or death, but to providence so far as it is distinguishable from predestination.

In treating of the permission of sin, he shows that when it is said that sin is permitted by God it must be understood as permitted in some mode which, generally considered, will be a suspension of all those impediments by the interposition of which sin might be prevented. And he considers that the impediments by which sin, as it is sin, is hindered, are the revelation of the Divine will, and the moving or persuading to obey the Divine will; and he draws the conclusion that consequently the permission of sin is the suspension of that revelation or persuasion, or even of both. He then examines the differences of sin, distinguishing between those of commission and those of omission, and how the Divine permission is accommodated to these differences, citing cases from Holy Scripture in support of his views. He gives two general or universal causes why God permits sin. The first is *the liberty of the will*, of which God made the rational creature a partaker. The second, *the display of the Divine perfection.*

Our author treats most successfully the subject of God being the cause of an act which could not be committed by the creature without sin, so as that neither is He the author of sin, nor is the creature free from sin, in the following way:—First, he states that God is the cause of all actions which are perpetrated by the creature, a statement which, without very great qualification, is most dangerous and misleading. But he goes on to qualify this by saying that the operation of God must be so understood as that nothing whatever be derogated from the liberty of the creature, or of sin be transferred to God; that is, that though it may be shown that God is the *effecter of the act*, He is only the *permitter* of the sin itself—the permitter of the sin as He permits to the sinner the free dispensation of His influence—the effecter of the act as He gives His concurrence to His creature's influence, without which the act could not be performed by the creature. And this he shows in this way:—"God is either the mediate or the immediate cause of any act which proceeds from the creature. He is the *mediate* cause when He influences the cause, and moves it to cause an act: the *immediate*, when together with the creature He influences to an act, and together with the creature is the total

cause of that act. When God moves the creature to cause, then, because the creature, as the second and subordinate cause, is determined by the First cause moving to a particular act, which has its species from the influx and motion of God, it cannot be that that act, of whatever sort it be, is imputed to the creature for a fault; but it is necessary, if that act can be called by the name of 'sin,' for God to be the cause and author of that sin. And since this can by no means take place, it is certain that, by that way of the mediate action of God, it cannot be explained how God is the cause of an act which is not committed by a man without sin, and the permitter of the sin itself. But when God is the *immediate* cause of the act which is produced by the creature, then the second cause, if it be free (as in the present case) had it in its power either to influence to action, or to suspend its influence, lest that action should take place, and so to influence as that this rather than another action should be produced. Whence it follows that, since the second cause has freely bent to its own act, and since by its own particular influence it has determined the general influence of God to this particular act, and constituted the *species* of the action; the second cause is in fault, and that act is rightly called 'sin' in respect of the second cause; but God is free from blame, and with respect to Him that act cannot be called 'sin.' For that concurrence and influence of God contributes nothing to the free will of the creature, whereby it may be either inclined to action, or assisted, or strengthened; nor does it constitute will in the first act, but in the second act; and therefore presupposes in the will whatever is necessary to action, not even excepting the concurrence of God; which although the will of a free creature has not in act, unless it operates with the act, yet it has it in its power, prepared and set forth for it, before it operates. If it be otherwise, the will cannot be said to have an act in its power or proximate ability: nor can it be called the *moral* cause of that act, but only the *natural*, and therefore the *necessary* cause, to which sin can in no wise be attributed."[1]

Some have thought that Arminius's scheme does in fact make God the author of sin, but this charge cannot be fairly brought against it. In his examination of Perkins's pamphlet he goes fully into the question, and his reasoning is very accurate and close. He treats first of permissions generally, and secondly of the permission of sin. The former he thus defines. God's permission is an act of the Divine will whereby God suspends any efficiency possible to Him, whether by right or by ability, or in both ways; which efficiency, if it were made use of by God, would either circumscribe or actually prevent a certain act of the rational creature, for the performance of which act the same creature has

[1] Examination of Perkins's pamphlet.

inclination and strength sufficient. But since the will of God is always directed by His wisdom, and tends towards good, that permission cannot be ordained by Him except to a certain end, and that the best. But there are two modes or species of permission, either a circumscribing of the act or a hindering. For the will of God is considered in two ways, either as that according to which He prescribes anything to His creature by commanding or forbidding; or as that according to which He wills to do or to hinder anything. He then divides the efficiency into two parts, the one the prescribing or giving of the law by which any act of the creature is circumscribed, by which limitation that act is taken away from the liberty of the creature, so that he cannot perform it without sin if it has been forbidden, nor omit it if commanded; the other the putting of a hinderance by which any act of the creature is hindered. But because God, if He so wills, suspends both kinds of efficiency when and where He thinks fit, there is also a twofold permission, the one by which He does not compel any act by law, but leaves it to the liberty of the creature, the other by which He does not put a hinderance to any act by His own action—that is, a hinderance by which the act will really be impeded, not by which it can or ought to be impeded.

In treating of how God may hinder the creature from willing to produce an act for which he has inclination and strength sufficient, he says, "A hinderance is put to the affection and will of a rational creature by God in a twofold manner, according to which God can act upon the will. For He acts upon the will either in the mode of nature, or in the mode of the will and its liberty. The action by which He acts upon the will in the way of nature, may be called 'physical propulsion;' that by which He acts upon the same by means of the will and its liberty, may fitly be called 'suasion.' God, therefore, hinders the will, either by physical action or by suasion, from willing that to which it is inclined with a certain affection. He hinders the will by *physical action*, when He acts upon it in the way of nature, in order that there may thence necessarily arise hinderance of an act to which the creature is affected with some inclination. Thus the evil disposition of the Egyptians towards the Israelites seems to have been prevented, according to the judgment of some. God hinders the will by *suasion*, when by some argument He persuades the will not to will to commit a certain action, towards which it is borne by its own inclination, and for effecting which it possesses, or fancies itself to possess, strength sufficient; whereby the will is hindered, not necessarily indeed, but surely. But because God, by reason of His infinite wisdom, has foreseen that by the propounding of that argument the mind of the rational creature would be persuaded, and that from that persuasion would issue the hindering of the act, He has no necessity to use the other kind of impediment."

As to *Freewill*, Arminius taught that man in his primitive condition, that is, as he came from the hands of his Creator, was endowed with such knowledge, holiness and power as to enable him to understand and perform the will of God, though this he could not do without the aid of Divine grace. That after the fall man was not capable of and by himself, either to will or to perform what was really good, until regenerated and renewed in his intellect, affections or will, and in all his powers by God in Christ through the Holy Spirit. When man is made a partaker of this regeneration or renovation, then and not till then Arminius considered that being delivered from sin, he became capable of thinking, willing and doing what is good, but not even then without the continued aid of Divine grace.

He did not consider freewill able to begin or perfect any spiritual good without grace, meaning by grace, the grace of Christ which belongs to regeneration. He thought this grace absolutely necessary for the illumination of the mind, the due ordering of the affections, and the inclination of the will to that which is good; that it was this grace operating on the mind, the affections and the will, which infused good thoughts into the mind, inspired good desires into the affections and bent the will to the performance of that which is good. This grace he taught goes before, accompanies and follows—it excites and assists, it averts temptations, assists and grants succour in the midst of temptation, sustains man against the flesh, the world and Satan, and in this great contest grants to man the enjoyment of the victory; it commences salvation, promotes it, and perfects and consummates it.

Such was Arminius's idea of Free-will and the operation of Divine grace thereupon—an idea essentially different from that of Pelagius, who transferred the benefit of the death of Christ, that is eternal life, from the special intention of God to the special operation of the human will. And yet Arminius has been accused of holding similar views to Pelagius on the subject of Free-will and Divine grace. So the view of our author is equally distinguishable from that of the semi-Pelagians, who taught that grace follows the will of man, and is given to men because they are willing to receive it.

As to the Perseverance of the Saints, Arminius considered that those persons who have been grafted into Christ by true faith, and have thus been made partakers of His life giving Spirit, possess sufficient power to fight against Satan, sin, the world, and their own flesh, and to gain the victory over these enemies, yet not without the assistance of the grace of the same Holy Spirit. Jesus Christ also, by His spirit, assists them in all their temptations, and affords them the ready aid of His hand; and provided they stand prepared for the battle, implore His aid, and be not wanting in themselves, Christ preserves them from falling, so that

it is not possible for them, by any of the cunning craftiness or power of Satan to be either seduced or dragged out of the hands of Christ.

In his pamphlet entitled "*Articuli nonnulli Perpendendi,*" Arminius on this point observes:—"The Church of Christ, from the days of the Apostles, down to the present time, has never reckoned that as an orthodox opinion which denies that it is either possible for true believers and regenerate persons to fall away from faith, or that they do in reality fall away from faith, totally or finally. Neither has the Christian Church ever accounted that opinion heretical which maintains the contrary proposition. Nay, the affirmative proposition has always had more patrons among the followers of Christ than the negative has obtained."

We may here mention that Arminius, in opposition to Calvin, held distinctly that Christ died for all, and not for the elect and predestinate only. "For," says he, "predestination rests not merely on the death, but also on the merit of the death of Christ; and therefore Christ has not died for the predestinate, but those are predestinated for whom Christ has died, though not all. For the universality of the death of Christ extends more widely than the object of predestination. . . The case of the whole human race is one; all were equally conceived and born in sin and children of wrath; and Christ assumed the human nature common to all, not from Abraham only and David, to whom Matthew traces back the genealogy of Christ, but also from Adam, to whom Luke goes up. He offered, therefore, the flesh which He had in common with all. 'Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood He also Himself likewise took part of the same.'[1] He offered for the common cause and fault—to wit, for the sin of the world—that flesh, in respect of which there is no difference between men; and the Apostle in the passage just quoted joins this cause, 'That through death He might destroy him that has the power of death.'"

From what has been said it will be seen that Arminius denies an absolute and unconditional election such as held by Calvin and his followers. He argues that an absolute and unconditional election to eternal life is inconsistent with the character of God, and opposed to the liberty of the human will. While Calvin held that God's election proceeds upon no prescience of the moral principles and character of those predestinated, but originated solely in the motives of His free and sovereign mercy, Arminius considered this required qualification, and in particular with reference to the reprobate thought that those not elected were allowed to perish not because they were not elected, but solely in consequence of their infidelity and disobedience, which being foreseen by God was the reason for their not being elected.

[1] Heb. ii. 14.

There is much truth in this system of Arminius—in fact the general outlines are most orthodox. It takes away that harsh and forbidding aspect with which Calvinism clouds the religion of mercy and benevolence. It is strange, however, to what extent the doctrines held by Arminius and his immediate followers have been perverted. The length to which their opponents have gone is almost beyond belief in attributing to them views they utterly rejected and would have shrunk from with abhorrence. As one Calvinist author very fairly admits—if a man hold that good works are necessary to justification; if he maintains that faith includes good works in its own nature; if he rejects the doctrine of original sin; if he denies that Divine grace is requisite for the whole work of sanctification; if he speaks of human virtue as meritorius in the sight of God; it is very generally contended that he is an Arminian. But the truth is that a man of such sentiments is more properly a disciple of the Pelagian and Socinian schools. The works of Arminius may be searched in vain for any such sentiments.

Arminius and his genuine followers admit to its full extent the corruption of human nature. They admit that we are justified by faith only and that our justification originates solely in the grace of God, asserting equally strongly with Calvin, that the procuring and meritorious cause of our justification is the righteousness of Christ. They admit further that the work of sanctification from its commencement to its perfection in glory is carried on by the Holy Spirit, which is the gift of God by Jesus Christ.

Bishop Burnet has some very sound observations on the differences between Arminianism and Calvinism, with which we will conclude our review of Arminius. He says, "It is at first view apparent, that there is a great deal of weight in what has been said of both sides; so much, that it is no wonder if education, the constant attending more to the difficulties of the one side than of the other, and a temper some way proportioned to it, does fix men very steadily to either the one or the other persuasion. Both sides have their difficulties, so it will be natural to choose that side where the difficulties are least felt: but it is plain there is no reason for either of them to despise the other, since the arguments of both are far from being contemptible. It is further to be observed, that both sides seem to be chiefly concerned to assert the honour of God, and of His attributes. Both agree in this, that whatever is fixed as the primary idea of God, all other things must be explained so as to be consistent with that. Contradictions are never to be admitted; but things may be justly believed, against which objections may be formed that cannot be easily answered. The one side think, that we must begin with the idea of infinite perfection, of independency, and absolute sovereignty; and if in

the sequel difficulties occur which cannot be cleared, that ought not to shake us from this primary idea of God. Others think that we cannot frame such clear notions of independency, sovereignty, and infinite perfection as we can do of justice, truth, holiness, goodness, and mercy; and since the Scripture proposes God to us most frequently under those ideas, they think that we ought to fix on these as the primary ideas of God, and then reduce all other things to them. Thus both sides seem zealous for God and His glory: both lay down general maxims that can hardly be disputed; and both argue justly from their first principles. These are great grounds for mutual charity and forbearance in these matters. It is certain, that one who has long interwoven his thoughts of infinite perfection with the notions of absolute and unchangeable decrees, of carrying on everything by a positive will, of doing everything for His own glory, cannot apprehend decrees depending on a foreseen freewill, a grace subject to it, a merit of Christ's death that is lost, and a man's being at one time loved, and yet finally hated, of God, without horror. These things seem to carry in them an appearance of feebleness, of dependence, and of changeableness. On the other hand, a man that has accustomed himself to think often on the infinite goodness and mercy, the long-suffering, patience, and slowness to anger that appears in God; he cannot let the thought of absolute reprobation, or of determining men to sin, or of not giving them the grace necessary to keep them from sin and damnation, enter into his mind, without the same horror that another feels in the reverse of all this. So that the source of both opinions being the different ideas that they have of God, and both these ideas being true; men only mistaking in the extent of them, and in the consequences drawn from them: here are the clearest grounds imaginable for a mutual forbearance, for not judging men imperiously, nor censuring them severely upon either side. And those who have at different times of their lives been of both opinions, and who upon the evidence of reason, as it has appeared to them, have changed their persuasions, can speak more affirmatively here; for they know, that in great sincerity of heart they have thought both ways." [1]

Many known as Arminians have departed sadly from the teaching of Arminius himself. A large proportion passing under his name have made the sole ground or foundation of the decrees or purposes of God in regard to the salvation of individuals, God's foreknowledge of the faith and repentance of some, and of the unbelief and impenitence of others. They consider that all that is implied in the election of a particular individual to life is, that God foresees that that individual will repent and believe; and that on this ground, this being the cause or condition moving Him

[1] Expos. of the Thirty-nine Articles; Art. xvii.

thereto, God decrees or purposes to admit him to heaven and to give him everlasting life—the result being thus determined by the man himself; and God's decree, with respect to his salvation, being nothing more than a recognition of him as one who would, without God's efficacious determining interposition comply with the conditions announced to him. Many too have corrupted the doctrine of original sin, and while admitting that man's moral power and capacities have been injured and deteriorated by the fall have not given due effect to the imputation of Adam's first sin to his posterity. They have also asserted a natural power or ability in fallen man to do something more or less that is spiritually good and that will contribute to effect his deliverance from the guilt and power of sin and his eternal welfare. But it must be remembered that these views are a departure from the doctrine as held by Arminius himself. Mark his declaration addressed to the States of Holland in 1608, the year before his death, "I ascribe to grace the *commencement, the continuance, and the consummation of all good*—and to such an extent do I carry its influence, that a man though already regenerate can neither conceive, will, nor do any good at all, nor resist any evil temptation, *without this preventing and exciting, this following and co-operating grace.* From this statement it will clearly appear, that I am by no means injurious or unjust to grace, by attributing, as it is reported of me, too much to man's free-will; for the whole controversy reduces itself to the solution of this question, 'Is the grace of God a certain irresistible force?' That is, the controversy does not relate to those actions or operations which may be ascribed to grace (for I acknowledge and inculcate as many of these actions and operations as any man ever did), but it relates solely to the mode of operation, whether it be irresistible or not; with respect to which, I believe, according to the Scriptures, that many persons resist the Holy Spirit and reject the grace that is offered."

One great objection to Arminianism as usually held is that it finds no support from the teaching of the Apostle Paul in the ix. chapter of the Romans, for there he certainly does not favour any such idea as foreseen holiness, faith, or merit, as the cause of Election. The very objections which he puts in the mouths of his hearers are the very objections which would naturally arise in the mind to the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination or to the Election of a body such as the Church, but objections which would not have a *primâ facie* plausibility as directed against the Arminian doctrine of God's merely choosing men because he foresaw their faith and obedience. The Apostle resolves the whole matter into the sovereignty and supremacy of God and men's absolute dependence and their incapacity either of frustrating His plans or of comprehending His counsels. "Nay, but O man; who art thou that repliest against God! A decree based

or founded solely upon the foreknowledge of the faith and obedience of individuals is, of course, the same thing as the entire want or non-existence of any decree in regard to them; for it determines nothing concerning them, and bestows nothing on them. It is in truth not an election at all in the proper sense, but a mere recognition of the future existence of certain qualities found in certain men, though God has neither produced nor decreed to produce them.

(*b*) *Calvinism.*

The scheme of Calvin, which was founded on the views of Augustine, was, the election of certain individuals out of the great mass of mankind directly and immediately to eternal life, while all other individuals are either passively left or actually doomed to a certainty of eternal death; and the moving cause of this election, he considered to be God's unconditional and irrespective will and pleasure, inherent in, and exercised in consequence of His absolute and uncontrollable sovereignty.

At the Synod of Dort this system was exhibited under the form of five distinct articles setting forth five distinct points of doctrine, and were arranged and summed up in the following terms:—

1. According to the fixed predestination of God, which, as its moving cause, rests, not upon any impulsory prevision of men's future characters and conduct, but altogether upon the Divine pleasure and sovereignty; some individuals, by a decree of *Election* are, out of the great mass of mankind, absolutely chosen to a certainty of eternal happiness; while, by a decree of *Reprobation*, all other individuals are absolutely passed over and left to a certainty of eternal misery.

2. Although from its infinite value, the death of the Son of God is abundantly sufficient to expiate the sins of the whole world; yet according to God's sovereign will its beneficial operation is so limited, that, in point of efficacy, it procures, solely and exclusively the particular redemption of those who from all eternity have been irreversibly elected to salvation.

3. Man's corruption, in consequence of the fall of Adam, is such that all are conceived in sin and are born the children of wrath, unapt to any salutary goodness, propense to evil, dead in trespasses, and the slaves of iniquity; nor does this inherent corruption, or this original sin, arise from a mere imitation of Adam; but by the just judgment of God it is conveyed and communicated through the propagation of a vicious nature.

4. The Elect, no less than the Reprobate, being unable, by any inherent strength of their own, to turn themselves unto God and holiness, receive in due time a moral invincible effectual calling, which, through the Divine Grace surely operating upon their hearts, they willingly and cheerfully obey.

5. Thus being made willing in the day of God's power, and thus obeying His efficacious call, the Elect, though they may occasionally fall into sin, yet, in consequence of the immutability of the Divine Decree, are always recovered to righteousness; and thence by the grace of *Final Perseverance*, through the appointed medium of general holiness, they at length obtain that heavenly felicity to which they had been eternally predestinated.

The scheme of Calvin teaches that God has by an eternal, absolute, irrespective, and immutable decree predestinated and elected certain individuals to salvation, and that all men who are not in the number of the Elect are rejected or reprobated by God, who has by an eternal decree predestinated them before they were born to certain and everlasting death and damnation for which He Himself prepared them.[1] And that to this end they were created and brought into the world, not because of any foreseen wickedness on their part, but solely because He wills it. Speaking of those who seem willing to assign as the cause of Election, God's mercy, and yet assign the "blame of destruction" to the individual, he says, "Although I grant that Paul (Rom. ix. 21) by the divers manner of speaking did soften the roughness of the first part of the sentence, yet it is not meet to assign the preparing unto destruction to any other thing than to the secret counsel of God, which also is affirmed a little later in the rest of the text. That God stirred up Pharaoh, then that He hardeneth whom He will, whereupon it follows that the hidden counsel of God is the cause of hardening"[2]

The modern Calvinist's reply to the allegation that they teach that God created some in order that he might at last consign them to everlasting misery is this:—That though the decree of Election is the cause or source of faith, holiness and perseverance, in all in

[1] Quod ergo scriptura clare ostendit, dicimus, æterno et immutabili consilio Deum semel constituisse, quos olim semel assumere vellet in salutem, quos rursum exitio devovere. Hoc consilium quoad electos in gratuita ejus misericordia fundatum esse asserimus, nullo humanæ dignitatis respectu; quos vero damnationi addicit, his, justo quidem et irreprehensibili, sed incomprehensibili ipsius judicio, vitæ aditum præcludi.—Calv. Inst. lib. iii. cap. xxi, § 7. Prædestinationem vocamus æternum Dei decretum, quo apud se constitutum habuit, quid de unoquoque homine fieri vellet. Non enim pari conditione creantur omnes: sed aliis vita æterna, aliis damnatio æterna præordinatur. Itaque prout in alterutrum finem quisque conditus est, ita vel ad vitam vel ad mortem prædestinatum dicimus.—*Ib.* Quid enim electi a reprobis differunt, nisi quod ex eadem exitii voragine a Domino liberati sunt? idque non proprio aliquo merito, sed gratuita ejus benignitate.—Com. Epist. ad Rom. ix. 23. Deum ex perdita massa eligere et reprobare, quos illi visum est.—De Præd. 613. Ex damnata Adæ subole Deus, quos visum est, eligit, quos vult, reprobat.—*Ib.* See Inst. lib. iii. cap. xvii. 7, xxiii. § 1, xxiv. § 12; xxv. 12.

[2] Calv. Inst. lib. iii. cap. xxiii. § 1. Calvinist writers employ various terms to express the revealed Will of God. They call it *voluntas præcepti*, *voluntas revelata*, *voluntas signi*, voluntas ἐναρέστιας. They are four designations of the same thing, presented in different aspects. They hold there is another will of God, indicated by events or results as they take place—a will distinct from that will by which He imposes duties and obligations. This will also passes under four different names, corresponding, but contrasted with the four applied to the Divine will in the former sense. They call it *voluntas decreti*, *voluntas arcana*, *voluntas beneplaciti*, voluntas εὐδοκιας. These again are four different designations of the same thing under different aspects. The former is the revealed will, the latter the secret or hidden.

whom they are produced; the preterition of some men (that is, the 1st or negative act in the decree of reprobation based upon God's good pleasure) puts nothing in men, causes or effects no change in them, but simply leaves them as it found them in the state of guilt and depravity to which they had fallen; while they admit that the second or positive part of the decree of reprobation (the preordination to wrath and misery as distinguished from preterition) is founded on the foresight of men's continuance in sin.[1] This distinction however does not remove the objectionable features of this doctrine.

It is but right to state that the last cited author, in common with many Calvinists, is careful to distinguish between the negative and positive decree of God—the one sovereign and the other judicial. The first, which is called non-election, preterition, or passing by, is simply decreeing to leave—and in consequence, leaving men in their natural state of sin—to withhold from them the grace necessary to enable them to repent and believe. The second, which is the positive judicial act—is more properly that which is called in the Westminster Confession "fore-ordaining to everlasting death," and "ordaining those who have been passed by to dishonour and wrath *for their sin.*" Of course the object of making this distinction is to make the decree subjecting the individual to be punished to have reference to his sin. The negative act of preterition is not made in consequence of sin or perseverance in it foreseen; indeed Calvinists admit that those not elected have not been greater sinners than those elected and brought to eternal life, for were unbelief foreseen or continuance in sin made the ground or cause of the first act of preterition as distinguished from preordainment to wrath because of sin, then might the perseverance in faith and holiness be made the ground of election in their eyes; and besides they consider that there is something about God's decrees and purposes even in regard to those who perish, which can be resolved only into His own good pleasure—into the most wise and holy counsel of His will.[2]

[1] *Calvinism and its practical results* by Princ. Cunningham, p. 550, who cites with approval Ames's statement of the views generally held by Calvinists as to the differences between election and reprobation, embodying the chief points on which the answers to the Arminian objections to reprobation are based: "Hinc prima imparitas rationis inter electionem et reprobationem; in electione enim finis rationem habet non tantum Dei gratia gloriosa, sed etiam hominum ipsorum salus; in reprobatione vero damnatio in sese non habet rationem finis aut boni. In eo nihilominus secunda imparitas est rationis inter electionem et reprobationem, quod electionis amor bonum creaturæ communicat immediate, sed reprobationis odium bonum tantum negat, non infert aut infligit malum, nisi merito creaturæ intercedente. In isto actu tertia est imparitas rationis inter electionem et reprobationem quod electio est causa non tantum salutis, sed et omnium eorum quæ causæ rationem habent ad salutem, reprobatio vero neque damnationis, neque peccati quod meretur damnationem, est proprie causa, sed ante-cedens tantum. Hinc etiam sequitur quarta disparitas, quod ipsa menia non habent semper inter se rationem causæ et effectus, permissio enim peccati non est causa derelictionis, obdurationis punitionis, sed ipsum peccatum." Medulla Theologica lib. i. c. xxv. *De Prædestinatione*, pp. 109-110.

[2] Cunningham's Hist. Theol. vol. ii. p. 430.

Calvin places election entirely on God's sovereignty, and he makes it irrespective of mercy, love, or justice. "We teach," he says, "nothing but that which is approved by experience, that it was always at liberty for God to bestow His grace to whom He will. I will not inquire whereby the posterity of Abraham excelled others, but by that vouchsafing whereof there is found no cause elsewhere than in God. Let them answer why they be men rather than oxen or asses. When it was in the hand of God to make them dogs, He fashioned them after His own image. Will they give leave to brute beasts to quarrel with God for their estate as though the difference were unrighteous."[1]

To a similar effect says Principal Cunningham. "What they (Calvinists) hold upon this subject is this—that God decrees on purpose, to do from eternity what he actually does in time, in regard to those who perish as well as in regard to those who are saved; and this is, in substance, to withhold from them, or to abstain from communicating to them, those gracious and insuperable influences of His Spirit, by which alone faith and regeneration can be produced—to leave them in their natural state of sin, and then to inflict upon them the punishment which, by their sin, they have deserved."[2]

Calvin considered that God's glory was manifest in the destruction of some men. He distinctly states this. He says, "The great and only object of our election is, that we should be to the praise of Divine grace." "God orders all things by His counsel and decree, so that some men are devoted from the womb to certain death, that His name may be *glorified in their destruction.*" With this agrees the Westminster Confession, "by the decree of God for the *manifestation of His glory*, since men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others preordained to everlasting death." And again, "The elect are chosen without any thought of their faith or good works, to the praise of His glorious grace. The reprobate are ordained to destruction and wrath for their sin to the *praise of His glorious grace.*"

But the Scripture does not bear these statements out. *That* connects the Divine glory with God's manifestation of mercy and justice. Thus, when God granted to His servant Moses his request that he might see His *glory*, He said, I will make *all my goodness* pass before thee, and I will proclaim the name of the Lord before thee, and will be gracious to whom I will be gracious, and will show mercy on whom I will show mercy."[3] This implies that the *glory* of God which Moses desired to see was inseparably connected with His goodness and mercy. See also the account of the glory of the Lord filling the Temple, in 2 Chron. v. 11--14.

[1] Cal. on the Eter. Pred. of God, p. 31.
[2] Historical Theology, vol. ii. p. 428.
[3] Exod. xxxiii. 18, 19.

The goodness of the Lord is ever associated with His mercy, and His glory is the manifestation of them both.

On this same subject Calvin further says: "If any man assail us with such words, why God from the beginning has predestinated some to death, who when they were not, could not yet deserve the judgment of death, we, instead of answer, may again on our side ask of them what they think that God owes to man, if He will judge him by his own nature. In such sort as we be all corrupted with sin, we cannot but be helpful to God, and that not by tyrannous cruelty, but by most upright reason of justice. If all they whom the Lord predestinates to death are by the state of nature subject to the judgment of death, of what injustice against themselves, I beseech you, may they complain? Let all the sons of Adam come. Let them strive and dispute with their Creator for that by His eternal providence they were before their generation condemned to everlasting misery. What shall they be able even to mutter against this decree?"[1]

Much every way.—There are two capital errors here which run through the whole of Calvinism. First, the condition of each individual personally considered in relation to God since the Fall; and secondly, in supposing that there can be no medium between denying eternal salvation and appointing to eternal misery.

As to the first point. Calvin confounds between our seminal state and our personal condition; he confuses imputation of sin with actual sin—original sin with personal sin.

There is no question but that when Adam, our first parent, broke the commandment of his God and sinned, all sinned in him. When he fell, all fell in him, for all his posterity were in his loins. God, therefore, in His justice imputes the sin of Adam to all his descendants—that is, He imputes Adam's sin seminally to all his posterity, because they were seminally in him when he sinned, and seminally they justly deserve all that Adam himself personally deserved. Hence it is, we are all children of wrath—all partake of the fallen, sinful nature of our first parents. Under these circumstances we must acknowledge that God would have acted justly in passing by us, in permitting us to remain in our fallen condition, and that there was no obligation on His part to send His beloved Son to free us from our bondage. Now, the wages of sin is death—death eternal—the punishment of sin personally and knowingly committed is personally and knowingly suffered—the punishment of sin seminally and unknowingly committed is seminally and unknowingly suffered. Therefore, when Adam sinned knowingly and personally, God would have been just in punishing him personally for it; but when his posterity sinned unknowingly and seminally, it would not have been compatible with the justice of God to have punished them

[1] Cal. Inst. lib. iii. chap. xxiii. § 3.

with an eternal punishment personally and consciously endured. No, the justice of God would have been properly meted out to them by a punishment seminally and unconsciously inflicted. For instance, a babe dying unbaptized, whose only sin was original sin—sin imputed through Adam's transgression—could not with justice have been punished by eternal torment, but might with justice have seen no resurrection—have in fact died eternally and utterly.

Calvin's decree of reprobation is such that all the vast majority of children whose only sin has been the imputation of Adam's sin, must be deemed to have incurred conscious, necessary, and eternal damnation.

As to the second point, the error of supposing there can be no medium between denying eternal salvation and appointing to eternal misery.

Calvin's argument runs thus: God was under no obligation to save mankind, therefore He is not unjust in passing by some men; for He might with justice have passed by all,—surely, then, He is not unjust if in the exercise of His boundless mercy He elects some. It will be found that this is the strong argument of the Calvinists in regard to God's justice in reprobation, and is brought out in a greater or less degree in all their writings. Some use the words, "passing by," others "not electing" or "not extending mercy infinitely," and so forth; but they all have the same meaning and are used to cover the real idea, which is Calvinistic reprobation—the absolute unconditional damnation of myriads of unborn creatures to everlasting torment.

Many are imposed upon by the artful use of words, and the veil which the upholders of Calvinism attempt to throw over their "horrible decrees." By the words "passing by" in the above quotation from Calvin, he means "absolutely reprobating to death and eternal damnation"—two vastly different things when properly understood, as will readily appear from the following simple illustration:—A sovereign may with justice reward one of his subjects without any cause by giving him a thousand pounds, or a thousand acres of land; therefore, according to the Calvinistic scheme, he would act justly in ordering, without any cause, a thousand lashes to another of his subjects!

Nobody denies that God has an absolute right freely to call whom He pleases, and freely to pass by whom He chooses not to call, and to elect some to blessings to which He elects not others. And further, that He has an undoubted right judicially to reprobate men for their personal sin, and to appoint stubborn unbelievers to be "vessels of wrath, fitted for destruction;" but this is all. St. Paul contends for nothing more. It is a reprobation as far removed from Calvin's as the east is from the west, as different (as put by one writer) "as appointing a soldier to continue a

soldier, and not to be a captain, or appointing a wilful deserter to be shot, is different from appointing a soldier necessarily to desert, that he may unavoidably be shot for desertion."

The truth is, that free grace is quite compatible with justice, but free wrath is absolutely incompatible with it. It is absurd to suppose that because God is not bound to show mercy to all those who have offended Him, or indeed to any of them, therefore He may show injustice and cruelty to unborn creatures who never personally offended Him in the least particular, by predestinating them to endless torment.

Another main objection to the scheme of Calvin is that it makes God the author of sin,[1] though this is stoutly denied by his followers. It must therefore be understood that we do not assert that Calvinists make God the author of sin, but that the scheme of Calvin's to us seems to require this.

Speaking of Pharaoh he says, "The word 'harden' when it is attributed to God in Scripture means not only 'permission' as some washy, compromising divines would have it, but it signifies also the action of divine wrath."[2] And in his Institutes,[3] he states most distinctly that the wicked sin and perish, not only by God's permission, but by His will and appointment; and further, that the judgment of God in punishing men for that whereof He has laid a necessity upon them is righteous, but how this can be, he admits is unknown to us.

How can Calvin be regarded as other than in the category of those who make God the author of sin, if we are to give effect to such language as this? Devils and reprobate men are not only held fast in God's fetters, so as they cannot do what they would, but are also urged and forced by God's bridle (ad obsequia præstanda) to do as He would have them.[4] That men have nothing in agitation, they bring nothing into action, but what God, by His secret direction has ordered is apparent by many and clear testimonies.[5] Surely, unless God did work inwardly in the minds of men it would not be rightly said that He taketh away wisdom from the wise.[6] God does not only harden men by leaving them to themselves, but by appointing their counsels, ordering their deliberations, stirring up their wills, confirming their purposes and endeavours by the minister of His anger, Satan.[7]

Calvin's followers are not far behind him. Piscator says, God created men for this very purpose that they might indeed fall: for otherwise He could not have attained these, His principal

[1] The two opposite errors with respect to Providence are those of the Epicurean philosophers and the Calvinistic Predestinarians. The former thought that God does not at all concern Himself about our sins, but leaves us to go on as we please, and as chance directs; the latter that God absolutely predestinates sin, and necessarily brings it about to accomplish His absolute decrees of eternally saving some men in Christ and of eternally damning all the rest of the world through Adam. The truth lies between the two—God's providence is peculiarly concerned about sin, but it does not in any way bring it about. [2] Com. Rom. ix. 18. [3] Inst. lib. iii. cap. xxiii. § 8, 9; cap. xxiv. § 8. [4] Inst. lib. i. c. 17, § 11. [5] Ib. cap. 18, § 1. [6] Ib. § 2. [7] Inst. lib. ii. cap. 4, § 3.

ends.[1] And Zanchius, another follower, says, "We grant that reprobates are held so fast under God's almighty decree that they cannot but sin and perish."[2] And again, "We doubt not therefore to confess that there lies upon reprobates by the power of their unchangeable reprobation, the necessity of sinning, yea of sinning unto death without repentance, and consequently of perishing everlastingly."[3]

It is true that Calvin considered the elect could not be saved without personal holiness,[4] but he held that as God's decree

[1] Lib. contra Schasm, Thes. 27.

[2] Damus reprobos necessitate peccandi, eoque et pereundi, ex hac Dei ordinatione constringi, atque ita constringi, ut nequeant non peccare atque perire. Zanch. lib. v. de nat. Dei cap 2, de præd. part 4.

[3] Non dubitamus itaque confiteri, ex immutabili reprobatione necessitatem peccandi, et quidem sine resipiscentia ad mortem usque peccandi, eoque ut pœnas æternas dandi reprobis incumbere. Ib.

[4] On the passage cited by one of his opponents from St. Matt. xxv. 34–36, who stated that when Christ calls the blessed of His Father to inherit the kingdom, He does not assign their *being elected* to be the *cause* of their title to the inheritance, but *because* they had *done works* of charity, Calvin makes some sound admissions, which it seems only fair here to notice. "Now," says he, "I would by no means hurry away men to the secret election of God, that they may, with open mouth, expect salvation from thence: but I would exhort them to flee directly to Christ: in whom salvation is set forth before our eyes: which salvation, had it not been revealed in Christ, would have for ever *remained* 'hidden in God.' For whosoever walketh not in the plain way of faith, to him the election of God can be nothing but a labyrinth of destruction. Wherefore, if we would enjoy the certain remission of our sins; if our consciences would rest in a sure confidence of eternal life; if we would call upon God as our heavenly Father, without fear; we must by no means make our *beginning* with the investigation of what God decreed concerning us, before the world began. Our contemplation must be, what God, of His Fatherly love, *has revealed* to us in Christ, and what Christ Himself *daily preaches* to us, through His everlasting gospel. Our deepest search and highest aim must be to become the sons of God; and to know that we are such. But the mirror of free adoption, in which alone we can behold so high and unspeakable a blessing is Christ, the Son; who came down to us from the Father, or the very end that, by engrafting us into His body, He might make us heirs of the kingdom of heaven: of which kingdom He is himself the earnest and the pledge. And as, moreover, this inheritance was once obtained for us by the blood of Christ, and remains consigned to us, on the sacred pages of the everlasting gospel, so the knowledge and possession of it can be attained in no other way than by faith. In a word, I not only now freely confess, but everywhere inculcate, in all my writings, both that the salvation of men is inseparately connected with their faith, and that Christ is the only door by which any man can enter the kingdom of heaven; and also, that tranquil peace can be found nowhere but in the gospel. I have moreover ever taught that whosoever shall turn aside, even the shortest step, from the gospel of Christ, and from faith therein, can do nothing but lose himself in doubts, ambiguities, and perplexities: and that the more confidently any one attempts to break in upon, and penetrate, those profound mysteries of God's secret counsel, without the gospel and faith therein, will ever, in so doing, get so much farther and farther from God. Wherefore, that the children of God, notwithstanding their election of God before all worlds, are to walk by faith, I deny not, but constantly affirm. Hence on these principles, another argument set against us by our opponent, is done away with, when he alleges 'that God will crown, at the last day, those gifts of His Spirit which He may have bestowed on His elect in this present life.' But this does not alter the truth and fact, that God engrafts by faith and by the sanctification of His Spirit, those whom He hath chosen in Christ, into His body. Nor does it alter the truth, that He calls and justifies, in His own time, those whom He predestinated to these blessings before the foundation of the world. Wherefore, Paul connects both these works of God most beautifully, where he says, 'We know that all things work together for good to them that love God,' to which he immediately adds, 'to them who are the called according to His purpose.'—Rom. viii. 28. This, then, is the way in which God governs *His own*. This is the manner in which He completes the work of His grace in them. But why He thus takes them by the hand at all, there is another and far higher *cause*, namely, His *eternal purpose*, by which He ordained them unto eternal life." The Etern. Pred. of God, p. 95-97.

secured the means as well as the end, and accomplished the end by the means, the same gratuitous predestination which ordained their election ordained their holiness also as a means.

It is obvious that consistency compelled him to hold that reprobates could not be damned without personal wickedness, but that as God's decree secured the means as well as the end, and accomplished the end by the means, so the same gratuitous predestination which ordained their reprobation ordained their wickedness as the means.

Thus Calvin says, "God sends His word to Reprobates that they might be made more deaf; He sets up a light before them, to make them the blinder; He gives them a remedy, that they might not be healed."[1] And again, "Those therefore whom He created for the reproach of life and perdition of death that they might become the instruments of anger, and examples of His severity; those that they may arrive at their end, He sometimes deprives of the means of hearing His word, and other times more blinds and amazes by the preaching of it."[2] So says Beza, "It should not seem absurd to us that God should offer His grace in His word and sacraments to some reprobates in the church, not to this end that they might be saved by it, but that they might be less excusable than others and obnoxious to the sorer punishment."[3] So Macovius in his Disputations. "Christ" says he, "knocks at the hearts of Reprobates whom He knows neither can nor will open unto Him, not that He may enter in, but partly that He may upbraid them for their impotency, and partly that He may increase their damnation." And again, on the 15th chapter of St. John v. 22, he gives this exposition, "Therefore did God speak to them that by the contempt and hatred of His Son, they might procure the greater damnation."[4] And in another place, "God propounds His word to Reprobates for no other end than that they might be left without excuse."[5]

Calvin certainly held the Manichean doctrine of absolute necessity.[6] He asserts this distinctly in his Institutes,[7] where he

[1] Inst. lib. iii. cap. 24 § 13.

[2] Quos ergo in vitæ contumeliam et mortis exitium creavit, ut iræ suæ organa forent et severitatis exempla, eos *ut in finem suum perveniant*, nunc audiendi verbi sui facultate privat, nunc ejus prædicatione magis excœcat et obstupefacit. Inst. lib. iii. cap. xxiv. 12, and in other places.

[3] Absurdum videre non debet, Deum reprobis quibusdam, qui in Ecclesiam Dei versantur, gratiam suam in verbo suo, sive etiam per Sacramenta sua offerre, non eum in finem, ut per eam serventur; sed contra ut minus habeant excusationis quam reliqui, et tandem gravius puniantur. Beza prelud. in cap. ix. Rom.

[4] Nimirum ideo locutus est iis, ut ex contemptu odioque filii unigeniti gravior condemnatio esset. Mac. Desp. 14.

[5] Deus reprobis verbum suum proponit non alio fine, quam ut inexcusabiles reddantur. *Ib.* Disp. ii.

[6] The great difference between Calvin and the Manicheans was that the former made the electing necessitating love and reprobating necessitating wrath flow from the same divine principle –he looked to God as the author of both, while the latter made them flow from two contrary principles, the one good and the other evil.

[7] Inst. lib. iii. xxiii. § 7.

says that God did not only foresee, but dispose the fall of Adam, and in him the ruin of his posterity. And he adds, "how came it to pass that the fall of Adam wrapped up in eternal death so many nations with their children being infants without remedy, but because it so pleased God! . . . . It is a terrible decree I grant, yet no man shall be able to deny but that God foreknew what end man should have ere He created him, and therefore foreknew it because He had so ordained by His decree."

By his doctrine of Election, he impeaches the wisdom of God, for he attributes to Him the design of creating reasonable beings, and then putting an irresistible restraint upon them, and reducing them to mere machines. By his doctrine of reprobation, he impeaches the mercy of God. He overthrows conscience "the light which enlightens every man that cometh into the world," for of what use is a monitor within if man is necessarily determined from without, he robs us of the very essence of God's natural image, which consists in self-determination and self-motion, and he makes, as already charged against him, God the author of sin. Further, he represents the day of judgment as a farce, for if God, by eternal, absolute and necessitous decrees, places the reprobate in the midst of a current of circumstances which hurry them on blindly to destruction, how can He send them into torment for those very sins which according to this theory He Himself has ordained that they should commit?

Men who are impelled by a force they cannot resist are incapable of either punishment or reward, and the supposition of God's ordaining from eternity whatsoever should be done to the end of the world, as well as the idea of His acting irresistibly in the elect, utterly overthrows the scriptural doctrine of rewards and punishments as well as of judgment to come. On what principle of justice can a man be condemned for not doing what he never had the power to do? If God of old ordained him to this condemnation and "who hath resisted His will?" if God "gave him up to a reprobate mind," by His Almighty decree before he came into existence, denying to him the grace by which alone he could have escaped from sin, how can he be justly condemned?

It is but right to mention that Calvinism, as understood by Sir William Hamilton, excludes the doctrine of philosophical necessity. But this is not the view of the great majority of Calvinistic Divines. They are willing, it is true, to grant man in the substance of his actions, as much liberty and freedom as, according to their view, a created being is capable of. They will even go so far as expressly to deny the determination of man's will either to good or evil by the application of external force, or by any necessity arising from the natural structure and inherent capacity of the power of volition, but this does not affect the doctrine of philosophical necessity which they hold. And it is

clear that Edwards and Chalmers regarded the doctrine of necessity as an indispensable part of Calvinism.

It is difficult too, to see how Calvinists can consistently disclaim the doctrine, as it seems but a logical sequence to their doctrine of Predestination. For, if as every Calvinist must hold, God has unchangeably fore-ordained whatsoever comes to pass, this certainly implies that liberty in some sense is predicated even if men's volitions and actions is excluded, and that necessity is established. But still it must be admitted that there are some who deny that either the certainty or immutability of the event, or the agency of God in regulating and controlling men's volitions, logically require or imply this necessity.

Sir James Macintosh, in an article upon Stewart's "Preliminary Dissertation," in the Edinburgh Review,[1] at one time adopted the view of Edwards and Chalmers and considered that it was not possible to make any argumentative defence of Calvinism which was not founded on the principles of necessity; but he subsequently altered his opinion, veering round so much to the opposite view as to assert Sublapsarian predestination to be irreconcilable with the doctrine of necessity.

Calvinists rest much on the "liberty or contingency of second causes," in order to account for a liberty of which every man is conscious. Thus the 5th chapter of the Westminster Confession on Providence, § 2, declares, Although in relation to the foreknowledge and decree of God, the first cause, all things come to pass immutably and infallibly, yet, by the same providence, He ordereth them to fall out according to the nature of second causes, necessarily, freely, or contingently." That is, that God in executing His decrees in providence brings about different classes of events in a way that is in full accordance with their own distinct proper natures, bringing to pass necessary things, necessarily, free things, freely, and contingent things, contingently. The liberty of second causes is maintained and preserved among free agents, notwithstanding the control which God exercises over all their actions in order to execute His decrees.

Some Calvinists, such for instance as Mr. Toplady, endeavour to justify Calvinistic reprobation with divine justice by an appeal to God's providential dealings with man in this present life. They argue, that if God may, without injustice, absolutely place man in circumstances of temporary misery, He may also without injustice reprobate him to eternal torment. But that He may place man in circumstances of temporary misery, evidence of the fact is plainly around, *ergo*, He may reprobate him to eternal torment.

This argument ignores the principal and true end of misery in this life, and is faulty in not properly distinguishing between a

[1] Vol. xxxvi.

time of probation and a time when probation is past. It would display equal wisdom to say that because a parent may corrrect his child, may use the rod for his admonition, therefore, he may justly beat him to death. The trials which God sends upon His people here are for their blessing, for their perfecting, for their eternal welfare. He "scourgeth every son whom He receiveth,"[1] and like the wise father "spareth not the rod."[2] It is in His love, and for the most wise and just end, that misery often marks our lot in this vale of tears, this time of probation, and preparation for glory.

The usual argument against Calvinism—that the doctrine as held by Calvinists is injurious in its moral bearing, as tending to lead men to neglect the discharge of duties and to carelessness of life, and in the improvement of the means of grace—is hardly sustainable, bearing in mind that they adopt the view that God has preordained the means as well as the end, and has thereby established a certain and indissoluble connection between them. In their view, therefore, to suppose that any elect person should continue to the end of life in a state of ungodliness and unbelief is to suppose an impossibility. It is equally a part of their doctrine thall all who are elected to eternal life shall certainly repent and believe, and shall certainly enter on and persevere in a course of new obedience. Consequently, they hold that no man can be saved unless he repent and believe, and unless he persevere to the end in faith and holiness. The fact therefore of living in sin would furnish to a man evidence that the means being absent, the desirable end had not been decreed.

Calvinism has enough to answer for without introducing into the charges allegations which have in reality little foundation. But it follows that in freeing Calvinism from this common charge the doctrine is left a little more than a barren speculation bearing no practical fruit; or, as Archbishop Whately puts it, reduces it to "a purely speculative dogma, barren of all practical results." We do not agree with Whately that this can legitimately be taken as a test, or as evidence of the unscriptural character of the doctrine, but it may fairly be taken into consideration as a basis for founding an argument by analogy.

Beza has been described as being Calvino-Calvinior. The main difference between Calvin and Beza was in the order of the divine decrees in their bearing upon the Fall—the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity, the extent of the atonement, and the nature and import of justification. Beza, as representative of what is known as the Supralapsarian position, taught that we ought to conceive of God as *first* decreeing to manifest Himself by saving some men and consigning the rest to misery, then in sequence and subordination to this decree, resolving to create man, and to permit him to fall into sin, thus making the object of the decree of pre-

[1] Heb. xii. 6. [2] Prov. xiii. 24.

destination man or the human race, viewed as not yet created and fallen, but simply as to be created. Calvin, as representative of the Sublapsarian school, taught that we ought to conceive of God as *first* decreeing to create man and to permit him to fall, and *then* as resolving to save some men out of this fallen mass, and to leave the rest to perish, thus stopping, as it were, before the Fall and regarding the object of the decree of predestination as men or the human race viewed as already fallen into a state of sin and misery.

The Supralapsarian system is the most offensive. It is founded on abstract principles, and by it God necessarily appears as positively decreeing and appointing the Fall, a position the Sublapsarians are able by their scheme to avoid.

It is true the latter admit that God unchangeably preordained the Fall, as well as every other event that has come to pass, but they assert they hold this doctrine so as not so absolutely to involve the idea of God as the author of sin.

It is a moot point whether Calvin was in reality a Sublapsarian or a Supralapsarian, the difference not having been discussed in his time; but the weight of evidence is decided in favour of his having been a Sublapsarian.

In addition to Beza we have Whittaker, Perkins, Gomarus, Twisse, and Voetius supporting the Supralapsarian views; but, on the other hand, Abbot, Dr. Davenant, the Synod of Dort, and the Westminster Confession of Faith followed the Sublapsarian hypothesis. The "Formula Consensus Helvetica," adopted as a test of orthodoxy by the Swiss Church in 1675, contains an explicit repudiation of Supralapsarism. The chief authors of this Formula were Heidegger and Turretine, both decided Sublapsarians.

Some adopt Calvinism to a certain extent, and reject some of its important tenets. They assert that God has from eternity chosen certain individuals to the enjoyment of certain blessings, that at least some of these blessings are spiritual and eternal, and that such individuals were not chosen to the enjoyment of them on the ground of foreseen faith and obedience, but were chosen to be believing and obedient men, that they might thus finally attain to the possession of these blessings. They hold the doctrine of eternal and personal election, but deny any decree of reprobation.

They say that the proper opposite of a decree to save some of the human race only, or rather that which such a decree necessarily involves, and without which it cannot possibly exist, is merely the absence or non-existence of a decree to save the rest. That there is a decree to save some members of the human family, and there is no decree to save the remaining members of that family—but that there is no decree *not* to save them. In opposition to Calvin who held that election and reprobation are inseparably connected

with one another, they assert that though there must exist in the mind of God a determination to do what He actually does, because His actions are the results of His volitions or determinations, it does not follow that where He does not act, where He does nothing, He determines anything. They consider it is childish to suppose that because when He acts, there must be a determination to act, when He does not act, there must be a determination not to act, since a determination is necessary to a state of action, but is not necessary to a state of rest. Why, they ask, should a positive determination on the part of God to save some of the human family be supposed to imply of necessity a counter and positive determination not to save the other members of the family?

Dr. E. Williams thus supports this view. He says: "That election and reprobation are inseparably connected takes for granted what can never be proved, that non-election implies a decree. Non-election is a negative term, not electing; but to decree a negation is as absurd as to decree nothing, or to decree not to decree. The notion of decreeing to permit involves the same absurdity; for, to permit, in this connexion, is not to hinder; but to decree not to hinder is the same as to decree nothing; or, as before, to decree not to decree. The fallacy consists in the supposition that non-election is a positive term, and therefore requires a positive determination by way of decree. The truth of the case is that on supposition of one million being elected to holiness as the means, and happiness as the end, the other million is not elected to holiness and happiness. These two things are as opposite as doing and not doing; but to suppose an infinitely perfect Being to decree what He does not do, is incompatible; for it supposes Him to decree to do, what He decrees not to do. It is, indeed, perfectly scriptural and rational to say that whatever is done by an infinitely wise Being, is done according to design, an unvarying purpose, which is properly called a decree; but what meaning can there be in His decreeing to do the contrast to His doing? The same reasoning is applicable to preterition. The mind, without due attention to caution, is apt to be deceived by the feeling which attaches a positive idea to the idea of the term, or the thing intended by it. We are disposed by common associations to conclude that, as to pass by is an *act* of a person, so the object passed by requires a designed determination for that purpose. But this is a fallacious conclusion. When a shepherd, for instance, passes by a number of sheep and fixes upon one, a voluntary act of choosing that one does not imply another voluntary act to pass by others. He knows all alike, and his wisdom selects the object of his choice, and this object he actually chooses, the others he passes by; but what is thus expressed by a passive term implies nothing positive with respect to the objects." And thus he proceeds to show it is with respect to God. He deter-

mines to save some, in the sense already explained; but that determination by no means, as he attempts to show, involves a counter determination in regard to others.

Those who hold the view above set forth consider it perfectly consistent with God's goodness and justice to exert an influence upon some to secure them salvation which He does not exert upon others. And they distinguish between His actions as the Moral Governor of the World and His actions as Supreme Sovereign. They give the following illustration: If two persons should present themselves in a court of justice, suing for the recovery of what they considered just debts, the judge, sitting on the bench, must only grant what the law awards to them. Should they fail to make good in law their claim to what they demand, no upright judge could award them anything as a *judge*, not even a penny. But if, compassionating their situation, he *as an individual* were to present them with a sum equal to what the hard decision of the law had just placed beyond the reach of their hopes, who could consider this conduct a just subject of complaint? Or if, as *an individual*, he chose to befriend one, and not the other, would the latter be entitled to represent himself as unjustly dealt with? The justice which as Moral Governor he dispenses is the property of the community; every one has a claim to an equal measure of it. But the wealth which enables him to administer to the necessities of the rejected suitor is his own; and every one feels that he has a right to do what he will with his own.

Now it is not in His public, but in His private character that any difference is to be traced in the conduct of God towards the beings whom He has formed. It is not in the relation of a ruler or a judge, but of a sovereign, the original source of being and of blessedness, who owes nothing to any of His creatures, as creatures, and has a most unquestionable right to do what He will with His own. The superior favour, which, according to the Calvinistic scheme, He manifests towards some of His creatures, is not displayed to them as subjects of His moral government, but as the creatures of His power; upon whom He has a most unquestionable right to bestow whatever measure of good He pleases.

Dr. Payne, who set forth the above views in his Lectures on Divine Sovereignty, etc., supports them with considerable force—It is a modification of Calvinism—Calvinism, in fact, stripped of many of its objectionable features, somewhat fanciful, however, and hardly consistent as a whole.

As the late Bishop of Brechin says, speaking of the Calvinistic scheme, "It tends to destroy all belief in sacramental grace. Without pushing the doctrine to its fatalistic consequences, which would destroy belief in all grace whatsoever save itself, this teaching, though held inconsistently together with other truths, tends to hurt the belief in the Sacraments; for with it there is no place for

sacraments in the divine order of the Church. A Calvinist cannot look upon Baptism as of any vital importance, if man's salvation depends upon an irrespective election, for he will not grant that grace reaches any but the elect, and as all are not elect, there are many who are baptised who never receive grace. Grace may be given, but, according to this view, grace is not necessarily linked to the Sacrament, even when (as in the case of infants) there can be no hindrance to the reception of that grace on the part of the receiver. If there is an inner circle of election within the great body of the baptized, baptism can be of no real value, and its continued use is illogical, continued merely out of deference to the letter of Scripture, and to an instinct of piety, which corrects the logic of the mind."

There is a modification of Calvin's scheme known as *semi-Calvinism*, or *Baxterianism*, started by Baxter, adopted by Milton, and vindicated by Milner, the Church historian. It strikes into a middle path between Calvinism and Arminianism, endeavouring to unite both schemes, and to avoid the supposed errors of each. Baxterians hold the doctrines of Election, effectual calling, and other tenets of Calvinism, and consequently suppose that a certain number determined upon in divine counsels will infallibly be saved. This they think necessary to secure the ends of Christ's offering. They admit in a sense that our Lord died for all, and that such a portion of grace is allotted to every man as renders it his own fault if he does not attain eternal life; still they consider that though to all Christian men grace enough is given to ensure salvation if they will use it, yet to some amongst them is givèn by God's eternal decree a yet greater degree of grace, so that by it they must certainly be saved. They apparently distinguish between common and special grace, conceiving that the former is given to all, and if improved will be followed by this special grace, which will end in final acceptance and salvation. Baxterianism denies, in words at least, any eternal decree of condemnation against any individual, and asserts in its place that all men may be saved if they please—that there wants only the will—that no one but the elect have that will, and that for this reason, and for this reason only, no other than the elect are ever saved. There are various modifications of these views held by those acknowledging the same names—differing as they approach nearer to Calvinism or to Arminianism.

Another scheme is that of Locke, known as *Nationalism*. He and others hold that the Election set forth in Holy Scripture does not at all concern individuals, but applies solely to nations. The Elect are held to be all Christian *nations*; for as God chose the Jews at one time to be His people, so He has now ordained certain nations to be brought within the pale of the Christian Church. This Election relates not to the eternal state in another

world of all the individuals of the nations chosen, but to the privileges conferred in this world on the nation as a whole. The moving cause of Election in this scheme is asserted to be that same absolute good pleasure of God which, through the exercise of His sovereign power, led Him to choose the posterity of Jacob rather than the posterity of Esau, that upon earth they should become His peculiar people and be made the depositories and preservers of the true religion.

Another scheme of Election was that held by the Socinians. They denied the certain prescience of future contingencies, and therefore they thought that the decrees of God from all eternity were general only; that such as believed and obeyed the gospel should be saved, and that such as lived and died in sin should be damned, but that there were no special decrees made concerning particular persons, these being only made in time, according to the state in which they were. They also thought that man was by nature so free and sufficient in himself that he needed no inward grace. Consequently, they denied a special predestination from all eternity, as also the bestowal of any inward assistance.

Chapter VIII.

THE PRACTICAL EFFECT ON THE HEART OF THE DOCTRINE OF ELECTION AND ITS ASSISTANCE IN THE PRODUCTION OF THE FRUITS OF THE SPIRIT.

"*The fruit of the Spirit is Love, Joy, Peace, Longsuffering, Gentleness, Goodness, Faith, Meekness, and Temperance.*"—*Gal.* v. 22.

The doctrine of Election is not to be regarded as a dry theory, or sentimental idea, but as a spiritual and practical truth. It is to be maintained as a principle to be proved and worked out under Divine teaching and guidance, by a death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness—by a brokenness of heart and contrition of spirit—by the love of God shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Ghost—by a constant warfare with the flesh—a hatred of all sin—by a following the Lord fully, a following of the Lamb whithersoever He goeth. The Elect must know Him, and the power of His resurrection. They must enter into the fellowship of His sufferings, being made conformable unto His death[1] not living as though they had attained or were already perfect, but following after, that they may apprehend that for which also they were apprehended of Christ Jesus;[2] treading in the steps of the same Apostle who said, "Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended; but one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus."[3]

The doctrine of Election is a doctrine full of life and peace to those who are exercised thereby, a most powerful incentive to righteousness and holiness, a constraining motive, a binding obligation on all to love and honour God who has so loved and chosen them.

No Scriptural doctrine can be barren of effect. The doctrine of Election is certainly no exception to this rule, for it will be found to be peculiarly rich in developing the spiritual growth of the child of God, and in calling forth those fruits which are specially enumerated in Holy Scripture as fruits of the Spirit. First, then, it is productive of—

[1] Phil. iii. 10. [2] Phil. iii. 12. [3] Phil. iii. 13, 14.

Love.

The most powerful motive to the love of God is found in His love to us. "We love Him because He first loved us."[1] "The love of Christ constraineth us."[2] A belief in the doctrine of Election implies a belief in the exceeding love of God—a love far surpassing human calculation. All that God has done or will do for His chosen is the product of electing love. It is the love of God to the elect which is the great theme of the Apostle in the eighth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans: "Who shall separate us from the *love* of Christ?"[3] "Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through Him that loved us."[4] "No creature shall be able to separate us from the *love* of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."[5]

The Apostle Paul points out how love to God is a fruit which the doctrine of Election is intended to produce. Thus, in writing to the Ephesians, he says, "He hath chosen us in Christ before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before Him *in love.*"[6]

Those who hold the doctrine of Election must acknowledge that infinite mercy and love which led the Father to send His only begotten Son into the world, that mercy and love which caused the Father and Son to send the Holy Ghost to enable God's children to see the everlasting sufficiency of the salvation brought about by the great offering on the Cross, and to experience truly the Father's love. It is the Father's love shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Ghost which is the very foretaste of glory. Whoever enjoys it has found what is more to be desired than gold, yea than much fine gold, sweeter also than honey and the honeycomb.[7]

It is an everlasting love, having neither beginning nor end. It is without variableness or shadow of turning. The Elect know that the motives are all in Himself, and are according to the eternal purpose which He had purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord, whereby before the foundations of the world were laid He chose them in Jesus Christ that they should be holy and without blame before Him in love.[8] His love discovered in time is the fruit of His love to them before time, for the one is the effect of the other. And the Elect know that there is no pure love in their soul by nature; on the contrary, they confess with humility that every affection in them is turned from the Creator to the creature, that by nature they are in bondage, slaves to lust, sold under sin. They cannot love God, infinitely lovely as He is, until the bonds are broken asunder which hold them in captivity, and they are made by holy baptism one with Him who has found acceptance in the Father's sight, and in and through whom the Father may

[1] 1 John iv. 19. [2] Cor. v. 14. [3] Rom. viii. 35. [4] *Ib.* 37.
[5] *Ib.* 39. [6] Eph. i. 4. [7] Ps. xix. 10. [8] Eph. i. 4.

look upon them with delight and affection. The freedom of the Elect of God is shown in the delight they have in His love, and it becomes their heaven upon earth to walk with their God in the ways wherein He has appointed to meet them, to love them, and to bless them. The panting of their soul is after more of this love. As the hart panteth after the water brooks, so panteth their soul after more of the presence of God, and of the light of His loving countenance.[1]

Man as created in the image of God, as a dependent creature with spiritual aspirations, looks even in his lowest condition to his Creator for strength and support. There is a desire for something higher,—a restless craving is experienced which cannot be satisfied with anything less than communion with God, its author. And this desire is intensified when a further relationship is effected, and God is manifested in the Person of Jesus Christ as the Redeemer, and further proceeds in the Person of the Holy Ghost as the Sanctifier. Yes, as these relationships are made known, the words of the Psalmist receive a power and display a truth which only the Holy Spirit could have brought to the lips of mortal man in the former dispensation, "O God, Thou art my God, early will I seek Thee, my soul thirsteth for Thee, my flesh longeth for Thee in a dry and thirsty land where no water is."[2]

This desire expressed by the Psalmist, experienced by many of the Patriarchs and Prophets of old, for a nearer communion with God, is the very glory of the Elect in the present dispensation.

It could not have been obtained but for the Incarnation. This was the starting point, the very foundation. In order that this precious fruit of the Incarnation might be reaped it was expedient that our Lord should leave us for a time. "He is now *with* you, but He shall be *in* you,"[3] gives the reason. If on earth those who had followed our Lord could testify to Him as the fountain of living waters,[4] how much more emphatic should be the testimony of the Elect, since He who was given that He might open their eyes and guide them into all truth has been so long in their midst. "Lord," asked Peter, "to whom shall we go; Thou hast the words of eternal life."[5] Peter had but the earnest and the promise. The great change in the relationship between God and man effected in the Incarnation waited the glorifying of Jesus on high, and the receiving and giving of the Holy Spirit. "Touch me not, for I have not yet ascended to my Father,"[6] were words spoken even after the Resurrection.

The very words of our Lord as to those athirst coming unto Him, when recorded by St. John, have the following context: "This spake He of the Spirit which they that believe on Him

[1] Ps. xlii. 1. [2] Ps. lxiii. 1. [3] John xiv. 17.
[4] Jer. ii. 13, John iv. [5] John vi. 68. [6] John xx. 17.

should receive, for the Holy Ghost was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified."[1]

From the day of Pentecost we date the time when it became possible for us to have that closer communion, that glorious unity with our Lord, which was the craving of the Patriarchs and Prophets of old as their hearts were stirred by the Spirit of God. The fountain till then sealed was opened, and the waters rushed out as a river from the Mount of God, and each taster of the Water of Life experiences the truth of the promise of our Lord to the woman of Samaria, "The water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up unto everlasting life."[2] His soul becomes "as a watered garden, and as a spring of water whose waters fail not."[3] The Elect are made so far like their Risen Head that they may give forth the Living Water they imbibe—the quickening Spirit received within. It is, in fact, part of their calling in this world, part of their standing as members of Christ, children of His love, to convey from the Fountain Head the Living Waters of the sanctuary.

"He asked life of Thee, and Thou gavest it Him, even length of days for ever and ever."[4] His life He giveth His Elect, His glory covereth them as with a mantle. He giveth them endowments, gifts, possessions. He revealeth His election, His Church, as the "fulness of Him that filleth all in all."[5] The former and the latter rain are hers.[6] Is it not recorded in Joshua,[7] of Achsah the daughter of Caleb, when she came as a bride to her father, who had given her a field, that she lighted off her ass and said, "Give me a blessing, for thou hast given me a south land, give me also springs of water. And he gave her the upper springs and the nether springs." And hath not the Election—the Church of God—the Bride of the Lamb received a south land whereon the sun is always shining? And hath not the Father given her the same blessing which Achsah sought for—the upper springs and the nether springs? On the day of Pentecost the upper springs—the living waters of the Spirit, flowed into the Church, fertilising and rendering luxuriant the soil of the kingdom, and from the Church where the nether springs are, the living water should evermore rise, springing up unto the source from whence it came. It is the spirit of oneness which is the source of strength. It is the voice of harmony, the unity and oneness of the Spirit—for the Spirit and the Bride say come, "And let him that heareth say come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely."[8]

The doctrine of Election, revealing as it does the great love of God to all, and His special love to the Elect, *must* call forth love in response, and should bring them into that holy state of mind

[1] John vii. 39. [2] John iv. 14. [3] Is. lviii. 11. [4] Ps. xxi. 4.
[5] Eph. i. 23. [6] Joel ii. 23, Acts ii. [7] Josh. xv. 18, 19. [8] Rev. xxii. 17.

required by the Divine law, the loving of God with all their heart and their neighbours as themselves. And like as the love of God was manifested in the Elect One, in the Person of our Blessed Lord, seen first in that natural body which He took unto Himself of the seed of Abraham, so must it be manifested in those who are engrafted into and made members of His mystical Body. The Temple of the Body *is* the manifestation of the love of God—the living stones thereof as the Elect are drawn together and firmly fixed therein by the love of Christ manifested in the brethren by the power of the Holy Ghost.

The Elect of God, as the living stones of the Eternal Temple, must manifest openly the indwelling presence of the Holy Ghost in love—love to God—love to all the creatures of His hand, for they all in some degree and in their appointed measure partake of His excellence and give expression to His glory.

This love must fill the hearts of the Elect and give a tone to all their actions. And there never was a time when such love was more needed than the present. We live in the days when each man seeks his own good only, in the midst of those perilous times when "men shall be lovers of their own selves,"[1] and the Lord looks to His Elect to reveal His love by forgetting themselves, renouncing their selfishness, counting themselves as dead to self and alive only to God, to labour for that bread that perisheth not—the bread which is the mystical body of Christ, even their brethren of the baptised.

He calls upon them to show forth that charity which "seeketh not her own,"[2] to give up themselves—their whole being, body, soul, and spirit, to their Lord, constrained thereto by earnest, devoted love, that love which will never fail, whose flame will burn brighter and brighter as the purposes of God gradually unfold, and the Elect are enabled to enter more and more therein, until they find themselves standing face to face with Him who is love, whose they are, and with whom they desire to be through all eternity.

Joy.

The Joy of the Elect of God should be unique. They alone can know it in its highest sense. They alone can know what is "joy in the Holy Ghost." It is the joy which our blessed Lord left with His disciples when he went away. "These things have I spoken unto you that *My joy* might remain in you, and that *your joy* might be full."[3] The kingdom of heaven "is righteousness and peace and *joy* in the Holy Ghost."[4] The Elect are introduced to this kingdom by holy baptism as heirs only; but as they have received the earnest of the kingdom, so do they experience the earnest of the joy of that kingdom. They know that they have been chosen and accepted in the dearly beloved of the

[1] 2 Tim. iii. 2. [2] 1 Cor. xiii. 5. [3] John xv. 9, 11. [4] Rom. xiv. 17.

Father. They have been drawn by the Holy Spirit of God to believe in the Father's love. They have received all spiritual blessings in Christ Jesus, and the full enjoyment of them is only postponed until the mortal probation is past. And should not this knowledge fill with joy the Elect?

In the *power* of God the Elect are presented with an everlasting source of joy. They know that it is exercised in perfect wisdom and love, and that by it He will accomplish His own most blessed purposes in them. Nothing which affects the interest of the creature is of small account with Him. His is the hand which feeds His children. His the power which sustains in health the life both natural and spiritual He has bestowed. He clothes the lilies of the field, not a sparrow falls to the earth but it is known to Him, His omnipresence teaches that all the perfections of the Deity are everywhere present, everywhere ready to be employed in the production of good, while His immutability proves to us that these perfections are ever unchanged. In the *knowledge* of God the Elect delight, for from it have flowed the innumerable beings and events of the universe, together with their attributes, operations, and effects. In the *mercy* of God they rejoice, for in it they have the assurance that they are forgiven and cleansed. They know that with Him is plenteous redemption, that none are cast off who would turn to Him, or permit of His divine operation in their heart. In the *justice* of God they delight, for in it they are assured of complete protection from every ultimate wrong. They know that it is exercised in perfect harmony with His mercy. In the *faithfulness* of God the Elect rejoice because therein they have the certainty that His "gifts are without repentance"; "His promises endure for ever"; and they are assured that "all things shall be theirs, and that all things shall work together for their good."

The Spirit of Truth brings to the mind of the Elect these precious attributes of God, and points out the results, filling the soul with joy and gladness.

"I will greatly rejoice in the Lord, my soul shall be joyful in my God; for He hath clothed me with the garment of salvation, He hath covered me with the robe of righteousness as a bridegroom decketh himself with ornaments and as a bride adorneth herself with her jewels."[1] These are the wedding garments with which the Heavenly Bridegroom adorns His Elect—His Bride, and in which He introduces her to the eternal banquet of love. Blessed are they who are called to the marriage supper and found clothed, they have reason to rejoice greatly; for they shall soon come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads; they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away for ever.[2]

[1] Is. lxi. 10. [2] Is. xxxv. 10.

If David's heart was so taken with that temporal power when he was chosen to be king before the house of Saul,[1] how much more should the spirits of the Elect be wrapped into the third heaven in the knowledge that they are chosen to be kings and priests throughout eternity. Should it not affect their hearts and raise up their spirits both to active obedience and service as David, who danced before the Ark with all his might, and also to all long suffering with joyfulness, as Paul and other chosen vessels, who rejoiced in tribulation because this electing "love of God was shed abroad in their hearts."[2] Are you exalted in the eyes of the men of this world?—then will ye look upon this your position as nothing, and less than nothing, in comparison with the exaltation put before you by the King of kings. Is your position poor and humble in the eyes of this world?—then remember how the Almighty hath taken you from the dunghill to set you among princes, even the princes of the world to come. This is the exaltation in which the poor should ever rejoice. And what more powerful testimony can the Christian bear to the sceptic than his never-ceasing "joy in the Lord."[3] Look at the man borne down with affliction, racked with cruel pain, yet "rejoicing in the Lord always,"[4] cheerful and cheering, revealing the Spirit of Christ's joy within. To the Elect all things in heaven and in earth call to mind the infinite love and goodness of God. Wherever he walks, wherever he is, he is surrounded with His presence: and in that presence there is "fulness of joy." To Him in his meditating and in His worship he instinctively turns as the supreme object of his affections and desires. In loving, fearing, and serving Him "with all the heart" he finds his chief delight, and is constrained to exclaim, "Whom have I in heaven, but Thee? and there is none upon earth whom I desire beside Thee."

Those who are not rejoicing cannot enter into the reality of what the Lord has done for them, nor apprehend to what He is leading them on. They cannot be living like God's children and making up their happiness in their Father's love, unless they are rejoicing in His rich and everlasting blessings. This joy is indeed a fruit of the Spirit, for when the spirit of adoption enters into any heart, it is manifested by belief in the love of the Father, and holy joy is excited in it. The Holy Ghost comes to make the Elect happy in the peace and joy He brings. It is in fact one of the very ends for which He is sent from the Father and the Son, and therefore it is called the joy of the Holy Ghost. It is His fruit, produced by His influence and kept by His power. It is like Himself of a spiritual and heavenly nature. It is the result of nearness to God, and the effect of communion and fellowship with our Lord Jesus Christ.

As the faith of the Elect increases, so does their joy, and when

[1] 2 Sam. vi. 21. [2] Rom. v. 5. [3] Is. xxix. 19. [4] Phil. iv. 4.

faith is weak, their joy is little. When the infinite mercy and love of the Father fills their hearts, then they are the most joyful. "My meditation of Him shall be sweet," says the Psalmist, "I will be glad in the Lord."[1] "Blessed is the people that know the joyful sound; they shall walk, O Lord, in the light of Thy countenance; in Thy name shall they rejoice all the day, and in Thy righteousness shall they be exalted."[2]

And the joy of the Elect is an abiding joy. God they know will never leave them nor forsake them. Christ they know will always be with them unto the end. Cast down for a time they may be, but not destroyed; afflicted they may be, but not forsaken; their joy indeed abideth. It is one of the "streams which maketh glad the city of God"[3]—a stream that never fails. "Not as the world giveth, give I unto you," said our Lord.[4] The world giveth empty joy, whereas Christ gives what is true and lasting. And it is as the Elect are filled with the Spirit that they go on their way rejoicing. The Lord comforts them and makes them glad with the joy of His countenance. He leads them through the valley of Baca, of mourning[5]—the only highway to the kingdom, but He provides for them a well in it, a fountain of living waters; He leads them on sorrowing for their departure from God, but made glad in heart at being brought back by His grace, therefore they weep rejoicing. But they are happy mourners, and witness that there is no such happiness as His service, and no joy like that of communion with Him, giving earnest and assurance that "in His presence is fulness of joy, and at His right hand pleasures for evermore."[6]

The Elect of all others rejoice because of the great things the Lord hath done for them.[7] They rejoice, first, in respect of the great things the Lord has already effected for them. They rejoice in the life and being He has given them in creation, and in the blessings by which they and all things living are sustained. They rejoice yet more in the redemption He has wrought for them from eternal death—by His own most precious sufferings and death upon the cross, whereby He overcame him that had the power of death, and brought forth that life which has sprung up for them. They joy in the imparted life of their Risen Head, and the gift of the Holy Ghost, whereby they are rendered capable of being filled with the divine energy of His life, and lifted up into heavenly places with Him. They further rejoice in the communion of the saints of God, living and departed, with whom they wait for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of their bodies, when all creation shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. Having been planted in the courts of the Lord's house, He watches over His elect with anxious care.

[1] Ps. civ. 34. [2] Ps. lxxxix. 15. [3] Ps. xlvi. 4. [4] John xiv. 27.
[5] Ps. lxxxiv. 6. [6] Ps. xvi. 11. [7] Ps. cxxvi. 23.

He guides them by the paths which, though not perhaps the most pleasant to the natural eye, are those which can alone lead them into the heavenly Canaan. "Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear Him, for He knoweth our frame, He remembereth that we are dust."[1]

The goodness of the Lord to His Elect cannot be told forth truly by mortal lips. They cannot even know it now in its reality, for not until they have attained the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ can they learn really the depth from which they have been raised, or the glories into which they have been introduced, and of which they have been made partakers.

They were in bondage to sin, and subject to the curse. Their Saviour has redeemed them from the curse. He has conquered him who had them in deadly bondage, and evil has no longer power to retain them in fetters. The redemption fee has been paid by the poured out blood of the Son of God, and their sins expiated by Him who has set them free. Hence they are debtors still, but not to the flesh which was corrupt, "whose work is sin, and whose end is death,"[2] but to Him who has delivered them from bondage and exalted them to a new position in the creation of God. He relieves them not simply from a penal death and from the consequences of the original transgression, but imparts to them His new and resurrection life—giving them the spirit of adoption, whereby they cry "Abba, Father."[3]

Righteousness is demanded of the Elect by God—an unimpeachable righteousness, for there is no such thing as a partial or imperfect righteousness. Failure in this is unrighteousness. "He that doeth righteousness is righteous."[4] "He that committeth sin, which is the transgression of the law, is of the devil."[5] "He that offends in one point is guilty of all."[6] In baptism, the Elect have received the life of Christ, and they must either be living that holy life or quenching it, and living the life of flesh. These two are contrary, and war one against the other. The duty of the Elect is to put off the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts of the flesh, and to put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness. The life of the flesh, that nature of the old man into which they were born into this world, that condition in which men follow their natural corrupt desires regardless of God, all this has been nailed to the cross of Christ. For the gift of God to His Elect in baptism is death and life—death of that flesh which is of Adam, corrupt, life from Christ, the second Adam, the first born from the dead. The new life is the very reverse of the old life, life of God, life *in* God, life whereby they have been quickened in spirit. And the law of this new life is mighty, through the Holy Ghost, to free God's

[1] Ps. ciii. 13, 14. [2] Rom. vi. 20, 23, Prov. xiv. 12. [3] Rom. viii 15.
[4] 1 John iii. 7. [5] 1 John iii. 8. [6] James ii. 10.

Elect from the law of sin and death which is in the members of the natural man. It is the law of existence of every one that is in Christ, so far as he abides in Christ. It is the necessary expression of the faith of God's Elect in His Christ. To walk therefore after the flesh is inexcusable. It is in fact the denial of faith, the refusal to trust themselves to Christ. It is a returning to condemnation, a quickening again of the life of that body of sin and death on which the full judgment and wrath of God will assuredly fall. If the Elect return to it, if they live in it, and after it, they must die; but "if through the Spirit they mortify the deeds of the body, they shall live."[1]

And is it not reasonable that God should require of His Elect the fruit of His own most holy life bestowed upon them? Is it not reasonable that those who have been delivered from bondage to this world and grafted into Christ should likewise be transformed and change into His image from glory to glory?

The Elect then must recognise the great things God has done for them. They must live the life their Lord enables them by His Spirit to live. They must praise Him for His goodness and mercy in having condescended to them in their low estate, in having stretched forth His hand to lift them from the fearful condition into which they had fallen. Looking back on that from which they have been delivered—a bondage far more grievous than that of the Israelites of old in Egypt—comparing its blighted unrealities with the spiritual glories now unfolded before the eyes of the Elect, and of which they have already received the earnest and pledge, how can it be otherwise than that their hearts should be drawn out in love and thankfulness to God for the great things He has done for them? Let then the Elect proclaim aloud the faithfulness of God, and rejoice in His goodness, being living evidences to their brethren around of the blessed fact that "the Lord has done great things for them, whereof they are glad."[2]

Peace.

The doctrine of Election, as taught in Holy Scripture, brings peace to the soul of the Elect. They know that *One* has finished the transgression and made peace by the blood of the cross. It is because the Saviour has brought in everlasting righteousness by His divine obedience that the Lord looks with favour and speaks peace to His body, the Church. The Father looks upon all the members of the body—the Election—as He looks upon the Head. He accepts them in the beloved. He beholds them in Him with perfect delight, and they rest and have peace in His love. He is His Father and their Father. He is related to His whole family in heaven and earth in the closest bonds of fatherly affection, and He makes His love known to them, and sheds it abroad in

[1] Rom. viii. 13. [2] Ps. cxxvi. 3.

their hearts by the Holy Ghost. He would have all His children to address Him under this dear name, "Our Father," and to expect from His fatherly love all spiritual blessings and peace in Christ Jesus.

This is the doctrine—implied in the doctrine of Election—which, received into the Spirit, silences guilt and produces peace with God. It is the result of trusting to the blood of sprinkling for pardon, and to the righteousness of Christ for acceptance; for by the shedding of the blood of Jesus Christ peace was made between God and man, and by the sprinkling of His blood peace is made between man and God.

The Father sent His Son to fulfil for His people all righteousness, and to be their atoning sacrifice. The Father has seen the work which He gave His Only Begotten to do, and has accepted it, and now He would be known as the God of Peace.[1] He is now a reconciled Father, loving His children with an everlasting love. Sin which had separated them from Him has been atoned for, and there is now access through Jesus to the heavenlies. He is the way to the Father. He is the new way—the living way—the consecrated way, everything needful for holy walk being provided in Him. "Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which He hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say His flesh; and having an high priest over the house of God; let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water."[2] Peace is then brought to the Elect by the blood of Jesus, and by His intercession as high priest over the house of God. As the Apostle says, "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God."[3]

The troubles and trials of this life are passed over with tranquillity as the Elect ponder on the purpose of God, and see in all those afflictions which attend them here the hand of the loving Father fashioning and fitting them for the eternal rest which remaineth for the people of God. By suffering was the Head in the heavens made perfect,[4] by suffering are those who are made one with Him to grow up into His perfect image and likeness. In the chastisements which come upon them, they recognise their standing as children, for "those the Lord loveth He also chasteneth."[5] The peace of God, which passeth all understanding, ever keeps their hearts and minds, and produces this fruit of the Holy Spirit to be shed abroad as a sweet odour to all around. The fact of their election is ever present to them, and they rely im-

[1] Rom. xv. 33, xvi. 20; 2 Cor. xiii. 11; 1 Thess. v. 23; Heb. xiii. 20.
[2] Heb. x. 19, 20, 21. [3] Rom. v. 1, 2; Eph. ii. 14. [4] Heb. ii. 10. [5] Heb. xii. 6.

plicitly on their Father's promise that "He which hath begun a good work in them will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ."[1]

Peace is an emotion, though a still one; it is a mode of the life which Christ lives in us.[2] "Peace I leave with you, *My peace* I give unto you."[3] It is the holy calm which marks the formation of Christ within the Elect. There is in them an absence of enmity and of unquiet. They have found peace, because they rest in Him who is their peace—the Prince of Peace. They love His law, they delight in His commandments, and experience the truth of what the Psalmist says, "Great peace have they which love Thy law." This peace is the fruit of the Spirit who inspires the love of the law and illuminates the darkness of the soul with a perpetual sunshine.

It was when the Apostles were to be left by their beloved Master to go forth unbefriended and unprotected into a world which knew not what spirit they were of, when evils were multiplying around them, that our Lord promised to leave them His peace. Strange, He was about Himself to endure the most terrible anguish, to suffer the accursed death of the cross, and yet He spoke of His peace. He had just completed His last meal with His disciples—had made in reality that offering of Himself which on the morrow was completed by the hands of wicked men—He had resigned Himself into the Father's hands. What more solemn moment could have been chosen for speaking peace to those He was leaving?

This legacy of our Lord told of a cessation of a preceding conflict, of reconciliation with the Father by the offering just made in spirit. It told of a renewal of the image of God, marred in the first Adam, but restored in the Second, whereby the passions and appetites of the human heart should be overcome of the Spirit of God ruling supreme in the children of His love, and confirming them in all things to the likeness of Him who was shortly to be revealed as the beginning of the new creation of God. What so opposed to peace as the rebel passions forcing the man to submit to their own dictates and hurrying him on in a course opposed to his conscience and in disobedience to the command of his God! The peace which our Saviour left with His Apostles, He hath given unto His Elect. It is *His* peace; which "the world can neither give nor take away." In life when the tempest rages around, when afflictions multiply, amid all his sorrows and labours, amid all the opposition, rejection, and persecution which he experiences, it is man's celestial companion, perpetually sustaining him. Gentle and serene, beautiful and lovely, she becomes a willing companion to every humble and faithful child of God. Where tempestuous passions had raged before, a heavenly sunshine succeeds. Where war and opposition within was once rampant, now reign quiet and harmony.

[1] Phil. i. 6. [2] Gal. ii. 20. [3] John xiv. 27.

And as in life so in death; this blessed fruit of the Spirit breathes insensibly into the soul the calm of that rest which remaineth for the people of God. It spreads before the mind in vision the glorious morn which dawns beyond the grave, and lights up even that dark valley which so many of the Elect have to tread, with the calm and peaceful resignation, the serenity and fortitude which it brings from the region from whence it comes.

Longsuffering.

The word rendered longsuffering is the same as the Latin "magnanimity," and both signify a greatness of mind—not of the mind intellectual but of the mind emotional. It is that character of mind of which comes patience. Longsuffering is therefore patience not in the sense of uncomplaining endurance of suffering, but in that of the "forbearing one another in love,"[1] to which all are exhorted in their mutual intercourse.

The Elect must look for rejection and scorn from this world, for the men of this world have always hated God's Elect. Why did Esau hate Jacob? Was it not because of the blessing?[2] And did not our Saviour say to His disciples, "I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you."[3] While in nature they love the world, and the world them; but when their election is evidenced by its fruits—holiness, and devotedness and love to God, then "a man's enemies will be those of his own house."[4] The Elect know that their Father may indeed smite them in His wrath for a moment, yet with everlasting kindness will He have mercy upon them.[5] In every gloomy and distressing day there will be gleams of sunshine, and openings of a serene, unclouded heaven. In the dry and thirsty ground where there is apparently no water, and in the midst of a desolation visibly without limits, "the desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose."[6]

Gentleness.

By gentleness we understand the goodness or kindness of heart which is manifest in sweetness of disposition. It is the opposite of harshness and moroseness.

It is a mark of heavenly gentility, and should be the marked characteristic of the Elect of God. Tertullian tells us how in early times among the heathen, the professors of christianity were called not *Christiani*, but *Chrestiani*, from a word signifying benignity and sweetness of disposition. The poorest in this world's goods must display the breeding of their Father's palace, and the manners of His heavenly and kingly court. Their Mother, the Church, is ever setting the example, and preparing the children for their Father's court above, teaching them to love as brethren,

[1] Eph. iv. 2. [2] Gen. xxvii. 41. [3] John xv. 19.
[4] Matt. x. 36. [5] Is. liv. 8. [6] Is. xxxv. 1.

to be pitiful and courteous, that the lovingness of relationship existing between the Elect, and which the Spirit inspires, may expand and bring forth fruit rejoicing to the eye of Jesus.

When the Elect consider how much the Lord bears with them, how kind and good to those who fall—how loving and gentle to the erring ones, should they not feel that if they are not evincing this same spirit to their brethren they are like the servant in the parable, who though forgiven so much by *his* Lord, yet threw into prison his debtor without mercy.[1] The Elect know that their election depends on nothing in themselves, but solely on the mercy and goodness of the Lord, shall they not then be merciful, pitiful, kind, and gentle to those who perhaps have not been blessed in so high a degree as themselves?

How exquisitely does the Apostle express the gentleness of heart which should animate the Elect. "We were *gentle* among you, even as a nurse cherisheth her children; so being affectionately desirous of you we were willing to have imparted unto you not the gospel of God only, but also our own souls, because ye were dear unto us."[2]

Gentleness is indeed the fruit of Him who did "not break the bruised reed, nor quench the smoking flax,"[3] who could rebuke and pardon with the tenderest pity. It is the gentleness of our blessed Lord which is the pattern for the Elect. Even to those who had transgressed the law and committed sin in its direst form, and who might have expected to hear the voice of justice and judgment only, the words of Jesus were gracious and forgiving. The wounded spirit was not utterly crushed by the sternness of the rebuke, but supported in its place until it had time to recover from its injury and raise its head again, not now in self-reliant pride, but filled with praise and thanksgiving, and glorying only in the Lord. This is the example for the Elect. Around them are to be seen everywhere bruised reeds, struggling to keep or to get back the footing they have lost. The hearts of the Elect must go forth in loving and gentle sympathy to such. They must be tender and forbearing, not pressing their virtuous indignation, however just, so strongly as to "break the bruised reed," but helping the wounded in the spirit of Him "who healeth the broken in heart, and bindeth up their wounds."[4]

Even the feeble beginnings of faith must be welcomed and assisted, the smouldering spark must not be quenched, but quickened into flame by the burning love of Jesus manifested in the hearts of the Elect by the Holy Spirit of God.

Goodness.

Those who hold the doctrine of Election aright, and understand that the great object of their Election is the blessing and welfare of

[1] Matt. xviii. 30. [2] 1 Thess. ii. 7. [3] Is. xlii. 3; Matt. xii. 20. [4] Ps. cxlvii. 3.

others, will ever be employed in works of piety and charity. They will understand that being elected in The Elect One—the one great Minister of the Sanctuary, they are to manifest the love and goodness of their Head. They will be zealous and laborious in promoting the glory of God both in works of faith and labours of love.

Holiness and goodness are always in Holy Scripture connected with Election. "Put on as the Elect of God holy and beloved, bowels of mercy, *kindness*, humbleness of mind, meekness, long-suffering; forbearing one another and forgiving one another."[1] The greatness of Divine love which the Elect experience ought to constrain them to live not unto themselves, but unto Him "who died for them and rose again." Their love to their Lord will be manifested in works and actions of love to their brethren, in whom they should see their Father's children, so that in the last day they may hear the approving voice, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto the least of these My brethren, ye have done it unto Me."[2]

The Elect know that the Father has chosen them in His Son that He might communicate to them of His goodness, and He has made them children of the light that they might reflect the rays of His goodness upon others. Their calling is to show forth the praises of Him who has called them out of darkness into His marvellous light.[3] They acknowledge that He has called them out of the deadness and blindness of their natural state, and has enlightened them with the light of life, and they know that this has been effected that they might enlighten the darkness of others. As the sun not only enlightens but also enlivens with his fruitful rays the face of the earth, and cheers every creature upon it, so do the Elect strive to let their light shine before men, giving them clear proof of their love to God by the goodness they manifest and display towards their brethren. And this they do that those who see their good works may glorify their Father which is in heaven.[4] The goodness which is the fruit of the Spirit will certainly show itself in outward act. It will communicate its gracious rays, and the Father of lights will have the praise.

Faith.

A full assurance of faith in regard to God's purpose may be expected in those who hold the doctrine of Election. The Elect rest all their hopes on the immutable counsel and purpose of the Most High. They know that the Almighty, in taking out an Election from among men, purposes to form a Bride for His only Begotten Son, that He forms the mystical Body—His Election in this dispensation that through her—His Church, He may work throughout eternity and bless the whole creation of God. They

[1] Col. iii. 12. [2] Matt. xxv. 40. [3] 1 Pet. ii. 9. [4] Matt. v. 16.

know, too, that "except the Lord build the House they labour in vain that build it";[1] and if they do not believe that it is the purpose of God thus to take out His election—thus to build a spiritual house, what reason have they to expect His blessing will attend the efforts of those who labour now in His vineyard? But if the Elect believe it to be God's determinate counsel to thus form the mystical body, His Church—thus to build a holy temple and to carry forward the work by human instrumentality in this dispensation until the top stone is brought forth by Divine grace, they may hope that their feeble attempts will not be in vain in the Lord.

The faith that pleases God acts in two different directions, and yet is one and the same thing. It presses *forward* unto the future, and *inward* to that which is unseen. It rests not in the past, neither the present, but passes on to the future, and dwells not in the visible. Faith embraces the whole purpose of God, and rests in no stage of the fulfilment of that purpose, however important it may be. The Apostles themselves were rebuked when they would have built tabernacles on the Mount of Transfiguration. That faith which comes from God, and without which it is impossible to please Him, is a living faith—a faith ever reaching forward to a more perfect realisation of the glorious purpose of God. Regeneration as experienced now, and affecting the spirit and soul, waits for its fulness and completion in the thing hoped for, and of which faith in the substance—Resurrection—for this is to the body what regeneration is to the spirit and soul.

The things that are hoped for are unseen as yet, but they are as proven and assured to the eye of faith as if they were already come. Faith has laid hold of Him who represents both the world which has been and which shall be. He apprehended the old creation and made it new. It may be said, indeed, that what is coming is substantially present with us; for it is one with Him unto whom we are united. The unseen is bound up with Him in whom, though now we see Him not, yet believing, we rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory.

"Believe only on the Lord Jesus and ye shall be saved," is the text of many of our brethren. It is ours also, for it is found in the Word of God; their limited interpretation, however, is not that which the Elect of God should embrace. The limiting of faith to the belief in the work which our Saviour effected for us on the Cross is a serious error. The faith of which the Scripture speaks is not the faith in any one work—it is faith in a *Person*, not a work only. And this Person is not only *Jesus*, but Lord. The faith, therefore, which is requisite is faith in the Person of the Lord Jesus as very God and very man, and *also* in the work He *has* effected, which He yet carries on in the heavens, and in

[1] Ps. cxxvii. 1.

the purpose of God which He purposed before the foundation of the world in Christ Jesus; for He alone is the revealer of God, the bringer of His purpose near unto us, and the end of all things.

The Elect may not stop short. They may not rest in Jesus crucified, but must pass on to Jesus risen from the dead and glorified;—glorified as the Head of the new creation of God—the first begotten from the dead—pressing on to the resurrection and glorification of His mystical body the Church. The Lord's purpose—its stages are developed by gradual steps, and there is a fear that the Elect may be tempted to measure the magnitude and dignity of the divine purpose by their own finite understandings—that they may be tempted to stand still at any point, and not press forward to the prize of their high calling in Christ Jesus, by the means and in the way in which the Lord may from time to time reveal.

The Holy Ghost was given to lead and guide the Elect into all truth, to unfold the mighty purpose of God as they were able to bear it, to tell them of the things which, as the Lord said on the night before He suffered, the disciples were not then able to bear,[1] to lead us from strength to strength, till every one appears before God in Zion.

The faith which the Lord looketh for and requireth in His Elect is not that abstract faith in Him which many possess, but that practical faith which realises not only Christ seated at the right hand of the Father, but Christ verily present in the midst of His people—present in His ordinances—seen in His sacraments—present by the Holy Ghost in this dispensation as a person in the members of His mystical body, by whom the Church becomes "the fulness of Him that filleth all in all:"[2]—present to give life and power, energy and vivifying effect, to every word uttered in accord with His holy will, to give sanctifying power to every form and ceremony of His house. Man lost everything by losing faith, by ceasing to trust in God. Recovering his faith man regains all—yea, far more than was lost.

The faith, then, which is the fruit of the Spirit is no mere intellectual assent. It is the belief of the heart, or what we usually term trust or trustfulness. It is a grace to be exercised both towards God and towards man. We must have faith in God, faith in one another, and be ourselves faithful. The Elect cannot continue faithful unto the end, save by the continual operation of the Holy Ghost; and this, indeed, is one of the fruits, one of the great ends for which the Holy Spirit was bestowed upon them.

Meekness.

The Apostle alludes to this grace particularly as a most appropriate fruit of Election. "Put on therefore as the Elect of God,

[1] John xvi. 12. [2] Eph. i. 23.

holy and beloved bowels of mercy, kindness, humbleness of mind, *meekness*, longsuffering, &c.[1] The doctrine of Election has a tendency to promote this grace of meekness. It implies the death of the old creature and the life of the new. It admits the utter depravity of the human heart; how we are all by nature children of wrath and deserving of everlasting death. It acknowledges that the natural man is opposed to any spiritual good, and though there may be no physical incapacity, yet there is a want of desire after holiness, a disinclination of heart to spiritual things.

Whatever views of human nature may be entertained by others, those who hold the Scriptural doctrine of Election must admit that their natures are entirely depraved; and if anything can create a spirit of humility and meekness in man, the knowledge of this fact is calculated to do so. The Elect concur with Job and say, "Behold, I am vile; what shall I answer Thee? I will lay my hand upon my mouth, I abhor myself and repent in dust and ashes."[2]

And as election supposes the total depravity of man, so it implies his entire dependency on the grace of God for change of condition. "What hast thou," asks the Apostle, "which thou hast not received?" From God we derive life, and breath, and all things. All of them are mere gifts of His bounty, and to the least of them none can make a claim. "That which He gives we gather. He opens His hand, and we are filled with good. He takes away our breath: we die, and return to dust." The doctrine of Election brings out this our dependency on God in strong colours, and it teaches, too, that the Gospel is not provided in consequence of human merit, but in consequence of human demerit—not to anwer any claim which we can have on God, but to show His love towards us. "God commendeth His love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners and when we were yet without strength, Christ died for us."[3] Election further teaches us to consider that God's mercy has provided that which justice did not entitle us to demand. His mercy has no motive in the creature. The objects of His mercy are corrupt, fallen creatures, deserving of His wrath even as others, and therefore He does not deal with them on the basis of desert. If He shewed them mercy for any forseen works of theirs, or because he knew they would repent and obey the Gospel and walk worthy of it (though these may be all conditions to be fulfilled by them) mercy would be turned to justice and would lose both its name and its nature. No, indeed! It is from the mercy and love alone of God that Election proceeds. The moving cause is in Him, not in the Elect. "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion."[4] Of His own motion and good will He resolved to give His Son, who should

[1] Col. iii. 12. [2] Job xl. 4, xlii. 6. [3] Rom. v. 6, 8. [4] Rom. ix. 15.

be the means of bringing many sons to glory.[1] What good can man have but what he has received from above? Are not the Elect constrained to cry out with the Apostle, "In me, that is in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing"?[2] God has one way of dealing with His children, "Not by works of righteousness which they have done, but according to His mercy He calls them and saves them."[3] All is from His own good will from first to last. And when he bestows any good it never is deserved, but is entirely an act of free grace flowing from the Father's love out of the Son's fulness, by the operation of the Holy Ghost; and it is given and continued to magnify and exalt the mercy of the eternal Trinity. The scheme of redemption is of mere mercy, and every one who is to receive the blessings of it must come in the character of a penitent supplicating for pardon through the righteousness of the Redeemer. It involves an absolute humiliation of human pride; for it represents man as totally destitute of anything in his natural character, or in his efforts, which can recommend him to God, or which can be regarded by the Almighty as any ground for his justification.

The doctrine of Election, then, teaches us that God alone is good, and that He it is who has wrought any good work in us.[4] All that we will and all that we do which is good and acceptable in the sight of God, is effected only by His grace. Truly there is no room for boasting, and no doctrine can be more calculated to subdue the pride of man and to promote the spirit of humility and meekness. The Elect know that it is not for works of righteousness which they have done or can do, but according to His mercy He calls and saves them. No flesh shall glory in His presence.[5] Boasting is for ever excluded, because all is of grace. Wisdom to teach the sinner knowledge, righteousness to justify him, strength to keep him, comforts to bless him, heaven to receive him—these are all the free gifts of God's love; for "by grace is he saved through faith, and that not of himself, it is the gift of God; not of works lest any man should boast."[6] Thus would the Lord hide pride from man, and teach him practically such Scriptures as this: "Not for your sakes do I this, saith the Lord, be it known unto you, but for mine holy Name's sake."[7]

It is clear that whatever good the Elect receive on earth or enjoy in heaven is so given as to exclude all boasting, and to lay every proud and self-righteous principle in the dust that grace alone may wear the crown and may have all the glory.

It thus appears that all boasting in our own works, all self complacency in our own moral and religious attainments, all reliance on our own deservings as sufficient to find acceptance with God are utterly inconsistent with the doctrine of Election as we

[1] Heb. ii. 10. [2] Rom. vii. 18. [3] Tit. iii. 5. [4] Is. xxvi. 12. [5] 1 Cor. i. 29. [6] Eph. ii. 9. [7] Ezek. xxxvi.

have endeavoured to set it forth. The Calvinistic doctrine of Election, on the other hand, cannot be regarded as productive of this spirit of meekness. So soon as one learns to look upon himself as one of the chosen favourites of heaven, eternally and unalterably predestined to virtue, holiness, and piety in this world and to glory in the next, to the exclusion of the great majority of mankind, he settles down to self-complacency and becomes infected and elated with spiritual pride, a condition very opposite to Christian humility. True it is, his system teaches him that his Election is not by his own works or for his own merits, but solely from first to last the effect of the gratuitous and unmerited, but the certain and eternal and unalterable preference of the Almighty. This he may confess with humility, but it is a humility which partakes of pride. We are not dealing with the theory, but with its practical effect on the heart. To hold the doctrine of reprobation we must lose sight of the love of God to all in the single attribute of His justice, and this is most destructive of the brotherly love which should shine conspicuously in the character of the Elect. It may be objected that in the doctrine of Election as above expounded there is greater room for boasting than in the Calvinistic scheme; but is this the case? It is true we believe that man is not altogether passive—not altogether a machine; we do not regard him as acted upon by a resistless force. We believe it to be in his power to resist and quench the workings of Divine grace, and thus grieve and alienate the Holy Spirit of God, and reject the merciful offers of Christ. But in his accepting the offer of mercy, is there really anything whereof to boast? Will the prisoner plunged in a dark and loathsome dungeon, when his chains are removed and the gate thrown open which confines him from the light of heaven, boast because he walks forth to liberty and life? The very nature of that faith by which we consider that a man lays hold on the offers of Christ assuredly silences all boasting, though he reject the doctrine of Calvinistic predestination.

Besides this, the elect are conscious that their own negligence and their own sinfulness constantly expose them to the danger of apostacy and of abusing the grace of God, and the feeling that without the indispensable aid of the Holy Spirit they will irretrievably sink into guilt and perdition, is a constant call upon them to walk humbly before God and in meekness in the sight of men. Surely the Christian who feels thus can scarcely find room in his breast for the sentiment of self-complacency or self-confidence. He knows he has to work out his salvation with fear and trembling,"[1] even to the very last hour of his mortal life, and that he is engaged in a conflict with a formidable enemy who may and would, but for the continual aid given from on high to the tempted, assuredly fall a victim to his subtlety.

[1] Phil. ii. 12.

The true doctrine of Election most certainly is productive of the spirit of meekness. It is to those in this spirit that God delights to give grace, and they delight to return Him His glory. The more He gives, the more glory would they gladly return. The sweet grace of humility is sent from heaven to relieve the Elect from the distresses which arise from the pride of the human heart, for into whatever bosom it enters it renders men kind to one another, tender-hearted, ready to every good word and work. Thus says the Apostle, "Be ye kindly affectionate one to another with brotherly love, in honour preferring one another." This is the meekness which is the fruit of the Spirit. He brings the Elect into humble subjection to God, and then to one another. And it is only as the heart is emptied of self that it is capable of receiving the fulness which is of God. The great idol self must be dethroned where God reigns supreme. Then is the promise fulfilled, "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven."[1] It is theirs now, not only in title but in possession, for the kingdom of God is within them.[2] "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth."[3] This is their future inheritance —the new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness.[4]

Temperance.

Temperance, or self-restraint, is one of the fruits of the true doctrine of Election. It causes the Elect to be moderate in all things, to keep their bodies under so that they be not led away by the lusts of the flesh. They are taught that though they are of the Elect, they must "work out their own salvation with fear and trembling."[5] They must be moderate in all things, remembering that though they may have preached to others, they may yet themselves become castaways.[6] They acknowledge a day of Judgment when the books shall be opened, and every man shall be judged of the things written therein. It behoves them, therefore, that their temperance extend not simply to meats and drinks, and other earthly desires and enjoyments, but to all that they say or do,—for every idle word an account will have to be rendered. They must keep their wills in subjection to the will of God, their thoughts and imaginations in check, their passions in subordination, and their speech free from malice or exaggeration. And all this because, as the Elect of God, they are bound to manifest temperance as part of the fruit of the Spirit. It is a grace, indeed, which is not a product of our feelings, but a result of a gift of God—a gift which must permeate the whole being of the Elect, and mark their walk and conversation in the midst of the world.

[1] Matt. v. 3. [2] Luke xvii. 21. [3] Matt. v. 5.
[4] Rev. xxi. 1. [5] Phil. ii. 12. [6] 1 Cor. ix. 27.

Chapter IX.

ON WORKING OUT OUR SALVATION WITH FEAR AND TREMBLING.

"Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling."—Phil. ii. 12.

This passage establishes two great truths, confuting at once the opposite errors of Calvin and Pelagius. It teaches, in opposition to the extreme views of the former, that we are not mere machines, that we are not under the influence of irresistible decrees, and that our ultimate salvation, to a certain extent, depends upon our own co-operation with the grace of God.[1]

It teaches, in opposition to the Pelagians, that all efforts in the way of spiritual life and strength must be ineffectual without the inworking of the grace of God, Who, as the Apostle says, "worketh in us both to will and to do of His good pleasure."

These are two great truths ever to be borne in remembrance. We are not to be merely passive; we must take an active part in responding to that to which God calls us. We dare not rest content with knowing the truth; we must also walk in it. "If ye love me," says our Lord, "keep my commandments."[2] "If ye know these things, happy are ye, if ye do them."[3] Knowledge without obedience is worse than useless—it aggravates our condemnation. Faith without works is dead before God.[4] This is most strikingly put by our Lord: "Many will say unto Me in that day (the great

[1] Grotius justly observes that those who utterly discard the doctrine of Free-Will can hardly avoid making God the author of all wickedness—an attempt which Plato himself declared ought not to be borne with in a Commonwealth. De Repub. lib. ii. The illustrious philosopher last quoted is most emphatic. "God, because He is good, cannot be the cause of all things, as some assert, but is only the cause of some few things among men; and no cause of many; for good things are much fewer than evil among us, and none can be the cause of good things but God: but we must seek out some other cause of evils than Him." De Repub. lib. ii. And as Sallust the philosopher, in his book *De Diis e Mundo*, says, "to attribute injustice or lust and wantonness to the overruling influence of fate, is to make ourselves good, and the Divine nature wicked." It is the tendency of human nature to run into extremes. It is the exception to find those who hold the golden mean. In the controversy between Pelagius and Augustine we see this exemplified. The former preached Free-Will, but confounded natural free-will with free-will rectified and assisted by grace, making too much of free-will and too little of God's free grace. Augustine was guilty of the opposite error (at least in his controversy with the Pelagians). He confounded righteous free grace with unscriptural free grace, and turned Free-Will out of its true place.

[2] John xiv. 15. [3] John xiii. 17. [4] James ii. 17, 26.

day of account), Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in Thy name? and in Thy name have cast out devils, and in Thy name have done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you; depart from me, ye that work iniquity."[1] And again, "Not everyone who saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven."[2]

The ordinary objection to predestination as held by the Calvinists, that it renders men's exertions unnecessary, inasmuch as if they are pre-ordained to salvation they will infallibly be saved without them, will not lie against the Scriptural doctrine we have endeavoured to set forth. We are taught that it is of God's free grace that, sinners as we all are by nature and "dead in trespasses and sins,"[3] we are "saved and called with an holy calling not according to our works, but according to the Divine purpose and grace given us in Christ Jesus before the world began."[4] It is of His free grace that, corrupt as we are by nature, we are cleansed and justified by the "washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost."[5] It is of His free grace that He gives us the power to walk in the path of holiness, that He puts "into our minds good desires." It is by His free grace that we are led to deny "ungodliness and worldly lusts," that we are enabled to "live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world, looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of our Great God and Saviour Jesus Christ."[6]

But all this free grace operates through appointed means. God has His appointed channels—His known instruments. He has, too, His own mode of conferring His grace, and we must ever remember that we are the recipients of what He gives to us for use according to His will and not our own. We are not to hide the talent in the earth, for the day of reckoning will most assuredly come. All the blessings which we enjoy in this life come from God; the blessings of life, health, and strength, all are His free gifts. And so with spiritual things—all we have comes from Him. But in all these cases the maintenance and the increase of our blessings depend on the use and exercise we make of them—depend on how we cherish them and faithfully defend them, how we value and regard them, and preserve them pure and undefiled. As Augustine truly says, "Qui creavit te sine te, non salvabit te sine te."

Man of his free will may either accept or reject the grace of God, and may also, even when accepted, use it for his own glory rather than the glory of God. Every man has the power of falling from grace so as to perish eternally, and every man has the power with the grace of God of working out his salvation

[1] Matt. vii. 22, 23. [2] Matt. vii. 21. [3] Eph. ii. 1.
[4] 2 Tim. i. 9. [5] Tit. iii. 5, 7. [6] Tit. ii. 12, 13.

with fear and trembling, a power which we have endeavoured to show is not in any degree affected by the foreknowledge of God, nor by any decree which He in His prescience may have made. As an old writer says, God's decrees being consequent on His foreknowledge, man's salvation or damnation is only infallible to God's knowledge, but free and contingent to man; God's knowledge, as knowledge, causing nothing, and His decree not altering or crossing, but ratifying that which He knew would be the work of man, working out his own salvation by co-working with the grace of God; or working his own damnation by forsaking God's mercy.

The foreknowledge of God, it is clear, cannot affect the duty of each individual. The writings of the Apostles addressed to "the Elect," the "called of God," "the saints," "the sanctified and preserved by Christ Jesus," "the beloved of God,"[1] are full of the most fervent exhortations to steadfastness in the faith, all of which exhortations, did the foreknowledge or decree of God place a necessity on man's actions, and were they incapable of falling away and losing their title to everlasting life, were, to say the least, mere surplusage.

On the other hand, it is most true that the doctrine of Calvin that God elects a few individuals to salvation, and that Christ died to make atonement for their sins alone, to the exclusion of the great mass of mankind, and that the salvation of these Elect depends solely on the absolute and irrespective decrees of God, and that no conditions are required to be fulfilled by them, no co-operation required on their part, is most injurious to the spiritual growth even of those who consider themselves among the number of the Elect, and most destructive of every true Christian principle in the heart of man. All the most desirable gifts which come from above are nipped in the bud, and a spirit of self-satisfaction and selfishness warps the feelings of the human heart. How can it be otherwise, when they deem it to be true and just that the great majority of their fellow-creatures are eternally doomed to perdition without reference to any sins or faults of their own, and without a possibility of escaping that doom which is the pleasure and the object of the glory of God, and that they themselves are eternally sure of salvation, however great and heinous may be their sins?[2]

[1] Rom. i. 7, viii. 33, xvi. 15; 1 Cor. i. 2; 2 Cor. xiii. 13; Eph. i. 1; Phil. i. 1, iv. 22; Col. i. 2, iii. 12; 1 Tim. v. 21; 2 Tim. ii. 10; Tit. i. 1; 1 Pet. i. 2, ii. 6; 2 John i. 13; Heb. v. 4, 10, xiii. 24; Jude 1.

[2] We will make one or two quotations to show that this language is not exaggerated. "Since the disposition of all things," says Calvin, "is in the hand of God; since the power of salvation and of death resides in Him; He so ordains by His counsel and His will that some among men should be born devoted to certain death from the womb, to glorify His name by their destruction." Inst. lib. iii. cap. 23 § 6. Again, "It is true that their own sins, under the direction of God's providence, are so far from injuring the saints that they rather promote their salvation." In Rom. viii. 28. "I acknowledge that this is my doctrine, that Adam fell not by the mere permission of God, but also by

It is marvellous how men can bring themselves to hold such soul-destructive doctrines—how they can ignore the clear scriptural doctrine that Christ died for all men, that salvation is proffered to all men—that the grace of God bringing salvation hath appeared to *all men*,[1] and that though our Lord has indeed perfected them that are sanctified, yet sanctification is a progressive act; the Holy Ghost sanctifying all the Elect of God by leading them gently step by step in the path of righteousness and true holiness, day by day pouring forth fresh grace that they may increase with the increase of God till they come to the perfect man unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.[2]

The Apostle Paul evidently knew nothing of the irrespective election or irresistible operation of divine grace, for he says, "Know ye not that they which run in a race run all, but one receiveth the prize? So run, that ye may obtain. And every man that striveth for the mastery is temperate in all things. Now they do

His secret counsel; and that by his fall he drew all his posterity to eternal destruction." De Occ. Dei Provid. p. 736. Many of Calvin's followers are much worse than their master. Look at Toplady, who asserts concerning the reprobate, whom he elsewhere describes as "necessarily and inevitably condemned to infernal death hereafter," and whose sentence he ascribes with Calvin "not to their foreseen sin, but to the sovereign will and determinate pleasure of God," that "God did not barely suffer, but positively intended and decreed them to continue in their natural blindness and hardness of heart;" that they are "vessels of wrath fitted to destruction," or, as he interprets the language of St. Paul, "put together, made up, formed, or fashioned for perdition;" that "God chooses and pitches upon men to do the most execrable deeds;" and that "He does not only negatively withhold from the wicked His grace, which alone can restrain them from evil, but that occasionally, in the course of His providence, He puts them into circumstances of temptation such as shall cause the persons so tempted actually to turn aside from the paths of duty to commit sin, and to involve both themselves and others in evil." On absolute Predest. pp. 109, 110, 111, 112, 160. Ed. Glasg. 1807. Another says that "the child of God in the power of grace doth perform every duty so well, that to ask pardon for failing either in matter or in manner is a sin; that it is unlawful to pray for forgiveness of sins after conversion; and that, if he does at any time fall, he can, by the power of grace, carry his sin unto the Lord and say, Here I had it, and here I leave it!" Fifty propositions taken from the mouth of Mr. J. Brierly, prop. 19, cited Mant's Brampton Lectures, 6th Ed. 138. Another Calvinist says, "Let any true saint of God be taken away in the very act of any known sin, before it is possible for him to repent, I make no doubt or scruple of it, but that he shall as surely be saved as if he had lived to have repented of it." "I say that when God doth take away any of the saints in the very act of sin, He doth in that very instant give them such a particular and actual repentance as shall save their souls. For He hath predestinated them to everlasting life; therefore having predestinated them to the end, He doth predestinate to the means to obtain it." Pryn's Perpetuity of a Regenerate Man's Estate, 339, 341. And another says, "No falls or backslidings in God's children can ever bring them again under condemnation, because the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made them free from the law of sin and death." It is well known that the doctrine of final perseverance as held by the Calvinists afforded comfort to that wicked man Cromwell in his dying hours—"This reminds me of a remarkable passage told by Dr. Bates, who wrote the *Elenchus Motuum Nuperorum in Anglia*. He, as a physician, was called upon to assist that night that Oliver proved a true deliverer of his country. The Protector was in great agonies of mind, often started, and asked them if they saw anything? At length he called for his chaplains; and the first question he asked them was, If there was any falling from grace? To which being answered in the negative, Then, said he, I am safe. For he supposed that some time or other in his life he might have had a little grace. And then his usurpation, with the murder of the King, and devastation of three kingdoms, besides much bloodshed abroad, and the overthrow of the Established Church, could do him no hurt! This is a short way of quieting conscience, and to lull men asleep in their sins! Thus poor souls are deluded by these doctrines of decrees." Rehearsal, vol. iv. p. 45.

[1] Tit. ii. 11. [2] Eph. iv. 13.

it to obtain a corruptible crown; but we an incorruptible. I therefore so run, not as uncertainly; so fight I, not as one that beateth the air; but I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection: lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway."[1]

Nothing could well be more repugnant to the doctrine of final perseverance as held by the Calvinist, or to the idea of salvation and our eternal standing being secured altogether independent of the concurrence of the individual. He saw that life was the period of the race, and that this period was the preparation for the next condition—time the preparation for eternity! Here it is we must learn the lesson of humility—here we must find out how impossible it is to rely on ourselves to do the work which alone can be acceptable above. It is the time of discipline and trial, the period during which we learn to walk the path of faith—to climb the hill of perseverance, to accustom our eyes to see while under the veil the spiritual realities which shall be manifest in glory hereafter in the light of the Sun of Righteousness.

Whenever in Holy Scripture we meet with passages implying that all spiritual blessings displayed to us are the sole gift of God, there are other passages in connection showing that it is our duty to seek and labour for those blessings. Thus, when the Psalmist prays, "Wash me throughly from mine iniquity, and cleanse me from my sin; for I acknowledge my transgressions, and my sin is ever before me; create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me."[2] In another he declares it is the duty of man thus to cleanse and renew his spirit, "Examine me, O Lord, and prove me, try my reins and my heart. For Thy loving kindness is before mine eyes; and I have walked in Thy truth. I will wash my hands in innocency, so will I compass thine altar, O Lord. But as for me I will walk in mine integrity, redeem me, and be merciful unto me."[3] So the prophet Isaiah says, "*Wash you, make you clean*, put away the evil of your doings from before Mine eyes; cease to do evil learn to do well; seek judgment, relieve the oppressed; judge the fatherless; plead for the widow."[4] So St. Paul says, "Christ gave Himself for us that He might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto Himself a peculiar people zealous of good works,"[5] while St. James represents it as the duty of the individual to purify himself, "Draw nigh to God, and He will draw nigh to you; cleanse your hands, ye sinners, and purify your hearts, ye double minded. Be afflicted, and mourn and weep, let your laughter be turned to mourning, and your joy to heaviness. Humble yourselves in the sight of the Lord, and He shall lift you up."[6]

It appears therefore that sinners are sometimes called to repent and reform, and work out their own salvation, and at other times

[1] 1 Cor. ix. 24, 27. [2] Ps. li. 2, 3, 10. [3] Ps. xxvi. 2, 3, 6, 11.
[4] Isa. i. 16. [5] Tit. ii. 14. [6] James iv. 8—10.

they are taught that no efforts of their own can be effectual, if attempted in a spirit of independence of God. The truth lies in the concurrence of man with the Divine grace of God. Man must look to Him to strengthen his weakness, to place him in the right way, and ever keep him there. Scripture thus teaches us that man has his true place; he is not to be exalted into an independence of his God, neither is he to be depressed into an irresponsible creature. The error of Calvin was great, but that of Pelagius was equal to it. It shows but how human nature is ever ready to run to extremes.

There is the most entire harmony between the merits of Christ—His free grace and our working out our own salvation. He has done something for us, and in the strength of this He expects us to do something for ourselves. What was the object of His obedience unto death? Was it not that in the strength of His obedience we might act in obedience? Salvation was purchased and grace procured that in the power of that grace men might attain to that salvation.

Our Saviour expects two things in consequence of His work for, and His endowments upon, man: 1st, that he should repent and become converted; and 2nd, that he should put forth the power of grace given to him in labouring for the salvation purchased for him by the blood of Christ. He, the Holy One of God, has alone merited salvation—and obtained it for all, but *He* is not to repent, believe and obey for them. He leaves a work to be done by the creature, a work which He Himself gives the power to effectuate. As Bishop Hopkins says: "So work with that earnestness, constancy, and unweariness in well doing, as if thy works alone were able to justify and save thee: and so absolutely depend and rely upon the atonements of Christ for justification and salvation, as if thou never hadst performed one act of obedience in all thy life. This is the right gospel-frame of obedience, so to work as if we were only to be saved by our own merits: and withal so to rest on the merits of Christ, as if we had never wrought anything. It is a difficult thing to give to each of these its due in our practice; when we work, we are too apt to neglect Christ: and when we rely on Christ, we are too apt to neglect working. But that Christian has got the right act of obedience who can mingle these two together: who can, with one hand, 'work the works of God,' and yet at the same time lay fast hold of the merits of Jesus Christ. Let this Antinomian principle be for ever rooted out of the minds of men, that our working is derogatory to Christ's work. Never more think He has done all your work for you. but labour for that salvation which He has purchased and merited. Could ever such senseless objections prevail with men who have seriously read this scripture: 'He gave Himself for us that He might redeem us from

all iniquity, and purify to Himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works?'[1] But truly, when sloth and ignorance meet together, if you tell men what powers their natures, assisted by preventing grace, have to work, and how necessary obedience is to salvation, they, with the sluggard, fold their arms in their bosoms, doing nothing: telling us these doctrines are Arminianism and flat Popery. But deceive not yourselves: whether this doctrine takes hold on your judgments now, I know not: but this I know assuredly, it shall take hold of your conscience either here or hereafter: and then it will not suffice you to say either that you had no power to do anything, or that Christ has already done all for you."

It is not only that we must work out our own salvation *occasionally*, but we must do it *systematically* and *constantly*. We must persevere in working it out diligently, with fear and trembling. It is only he who perseveres to the end who will be saved.[2] We are exhorted to "fight the good fight of faith,"[3] which is a continuous fight, and we are so exhorted, not because we have laid hold of, but that we may "lay hold of eternal life."[4] And this is a distinction which should be carefully borne in mind, for though in one sense we have begun to live that life, by reason of our having received the resurrection life of Christ in our spirits, yet that eternal life will not be completely taken hold of until the day of the "redemption of the body," and the perfect "manifestation of the sons of God."[5]

Our God is no respecter of persons. He may give more grace to some than to others, but He looks to one for greater results than to the other. He gathers not where He has not sown, and requires not, at the hand of the creature, more than he has, by the grace of God, been enabled to render. The chosen people themselves were distinctly warned that God was no respecter of persons,[6] and throughout the Bible this truth most plainly appears. Recall to mind the threatening message to Eli on account of the wickedness of his sons.[7] "Wherefore the Lord God of Israel saith, I said indeed, that thy house and the house of thy father should walk before me for ever; but now the Lord saith, be it far from Me, for them that honour Me, I will honour, and they that despise Me shall be lightly esteemed." There is a similar declaration in Num. xiv. 28-34, which concludes in these words, "and ye shall know My breach of promise." So again, when Samuel is expostulating with the people on their asking for a king,[8] "And Samuel said unto the people, Fear not; ye have done all this wickedness; yet turn not aside from following the Lord, but serve the Lord with all your heart; and turn ye not aside, for then should ye go after vain things, which cannot profit nor deliver; for they are vain;

[1] Titus ii. 14. [2] Matt. x. 22 xxiv. 13. [3] 1 Tim. vi. 12. [4] 1 Tim. vi. 12.
[5] Rom. viii. 19. [6] Deut. x. 17. [7] 1 Sam. ii. 30. [8] 1 Sam. xii. 20-25.

for the Lord will not forsake His people for His great name's sake, because it hath pleased the Lord to make you His people. Moreover, as for me, God forbid that I should sin against the Lord in ceasing to pray for you; but I will teach you the good and the right way. Only fear the Lord and serve Him in truth with all your heart; for consider how great things He hath done for you. But if ye shall still do wickedly, ye shall be consumed, both ye and your king."

Such are some of the warnings wherein God shows us that He is no respecter of persons, and he who turns from the ways of the Lord, however much grace may have been bestowed upon him, shall find himself in the gulf of destruction. Examples are many of such falls, and they are recorded in Holy Scripture for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come.[1] Let us then walk humbly before God, striving ever to keep the narrow way which leads to the heavenly Canaan. And is not the end glorious? Is it not worth the striving for, and the patience required? Does not the glory of the end light up the whole way to the eye of faith? Our Lord Himself endured all for the joy set before Him,[2] and the Apostle says that which is most solemnly true, "If in *this life* only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable."[3]

In this life no doubt there is a species of enjoyment in living in and for the world. Desire begets desire. To live only for the world to come requires self-sacrifice, requires a bartering of that which is seen, for that which is unseen, a giving up of that which satisfies the senses in time present for that which shall satisfy the spirit in eternity.

The first and great thing God requires of His people is obedience. Without faith no man can please God.[4] Man can only be obedient as he has faith. Without faith obedience itself would not be acceptable in God's sight. Man must wait for each act of God to be effected in His own way—at His own good time. Adam's sin was want of faith—failure in obedience. Man *was* intended to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil—yea, and of the tree of life also, but it was to be in God's own good time—when they could be eaten in faith—partaken of in obedience.

The moment the tree of the knowledge of good and evil was partaken of, fear entered into the heart of Adam. Was not knowledge quickly displayed? Truly the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom; but knowledge without life how dark, how gloomy! The gracious promise, however, of deliverance soon fell from the lips of the All-merciful God, and hope's rays again enlightened the souls of the erring ones.

True wisdom and eternal life were manifested and brought to light in the gospel by the second Adam, and as by one man's

[1] 1 Cor. x. 11. [2] Heb. xii. 2. [3] 1 Cor. xv. 19. [4] Heb. xi. 6.

disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of One are many made righteous.[1] The natural man brings forth his offspring according to his image, by that natural power with which God blessed him at his first creation when He said, "Be fruitful and multiply;"[2] and so the second Adam, consecrated and blessed of God, as the beginning of the new creation, bringeth forth His offspring newborn, according to His image by the Spirit. "As many," says St. John, "as received Him to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name. which were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God."[3] And as St. Paul says, "We are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works."[4]

Christ, by His obedience unto death,—by His resurrection and ascension, and gift on the Day of Pentecost, brought into being for us a new mode of existence. By these acts of Christ it became possible for us to become partakers of His life—a life distinct from that derived from the first Adam. The new nature came in the form of life—"life from the dead;" and not in the sense of "life and conversation," a continuance of active being, but in the form of a living substance irrespective of action, but capable of feeling and action, and a course of life afterwards. Life is the condition in which the living subject fulfils its functions according to the law of its existence. A principle of life—a condition of existence we receive from our first parents—this is our natural life. A new principle of life—a new condition of existence is received when the spirit is quickened with the life of Christ in baptism. This is the new birth—the spiritual life—Regeneration. The man is brought into a new phase of existence, previously unknown, being rendered capable of the functions of spiritual life by the continual presence and operation of the Holy Ghost. We live henceforth and act above all the power of nature by a higher principle of life than even animated Adam in Paradise, even by Christ and His Spirit living and acting in us.

Our life is now hid with Christ in God[5]—it is not now manifest, hence it is our duty to live not for the present by sight, but for the future by faith. Time bears no comparison with eternity. The man who lives here 60, or 70, or 80 years, looking back when time has passed away for ever and eternity has succeeded, will see but a spot or speck, as it were, in the ocean of time. He will look back and wonder how during the time allotted to him for preparation for the future, he should have lived so entirely in and for the present without regard to the purpose of God in him and the work He would have effected through and by him.

This is our time of preparation for what is to succeed—the time during which we are to "work out our own salvation,"[6] and

[1] Rom. v. 19. [2] Gen. i. 28. [3] John i. 12, 13.
[4] Eph. ii. 10. [5] Col. iii. 3. [6] Phil. ii. 12.

the night cometh when no man can work. We are now called upon to walk in the world, and yet not be of it.[1] We are to walk as those who have no abiding citizenship here[2]—as those whom the angels of the Lord ever watch over and attend, as those whose steps are marked and ordered by the Lord—whose spirits are already risen and whose bodies but wait for their clothing from above. It is *not* at a future time that all the glory is to be revealed. We receive even now the foretaste—the earnest of the kingdom. Truly we are *now* come unto Mount Zion and unto the city of the Living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels. We are *now* come unto the general assembly and church of the first-born which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all and to the spirits of just men made perfect. We receive *now* a kingdom which cannot be moved; we wait but the final act of God which shall pass upon our bodies.

The joy is in our spirits—our bodies still suffer, and we must accept our position now as a preparation for that which is to follow. We have not yet passed out of the valley of humiliation. The path of suffering is not yet left for the Celestial city. But we are called upon to endure all for the glory set before. The martyrs of old could submit to bonds and imprisonment, to torture and to death, for they looked for the life of the world to come. Take away their everlasting life, would *they* not have been of all men most miserable?

Most truly, if we would follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth, we must follow in humility; must taste of His sorrows, be despised as He was despised, be rejected of men as He was, that we may, through suffering, be prepared for the eternal joys to follow and to which the Lord will yet raise His suffering children. If in this life only we have hope we are of all men most miserable, for we wander through the world, having no certain habitation, no abiding place, our life is passed in journeyings, in perils, in weariness and painfulness, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, and cold and nakedness. All these things are the lot of many of God's Elect people, but their assurance in God remains unshaken. They rest in His promise, "Every man that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands for My name's sake shall receive a hundred fold and shall inherit everlasting life."[3]

The sacrifice of Christ—His self-dedication must be seen in measure in each of the members of His body mystical. The Lord looketh that the elect tread in the path of suffering which He trod, that their feet being shod with the gospel of peace they may go forth in His power, carrying His Word, His offer of mercy and peace to those sheep of His who have wandered on every hill of

[1] John xvii. 15. [2] Phil. iii. 20. [3] Matt. xix. 29.

Christendom, and still eat of the husks of human knowledge and vanity. Elect warriors, yea, valiant men reduced in number by the testing of the Lord like the followers of Gideon,[1] strong in the power of the spirit, whose love to God shall have wrought out in them love to His suffering creation, and who, with devoted lives, will yield themselves to Him that He may use them in His service.

Let us ever remember that if we are elect, we are chosen to the service of God. Our election is for the purpose of being special instruments in the hands of the Lord for blessing others. We may not be able to see the exact mode in which God would use us, neither shall we ever see our way distinctly in our present condition, for we walk by faith and not by sight. The light of the seven golden candlesticks now sheds its rays over our path, and prepares us for the greater light yet to be revealed when we shall be able to walk by sight. But it is only as we walk in the light of the lesser light now that we shall be able to see in that all resplendent day when the "Sun of Righteousness shall arise with healing in His wings."[2]

It is hope within which makes us joyful, and bears us onward in the narrow way. The most joyous of God's creation should be those who know most of His mind, feel most of His love, learn most of His unfathomable purposes. Are not these His Elect? Who stand more in the light of His glory than His Elect? Who have received the earnest of the future joy as they have? Then should their hearts beat with joy—their faces shine like Moses. "Rejoice in the Lord always, and again I say rejoice."[3] Have we not been brought in Spirit into that promised kingdom—our Father's house? Yes, indeed, and have already tasted of that joy—that joy abiding which no man taketh from us. As we abide in Him, the world touches us not; it dares not enter into the Sanctuary of God's presence with its trivial cares, anxieties, and worries.

Our hope—the hope of the Elect—is in Him, the Risen One. It is part of our life, that life which is hid with Christ in God—that same life—resurrection life—with which our spirits are quickened in baptism and made alive unto God by the mighty energy of the Holy Ghost. Our hope is in Christ. He *in* us is our hope of glory. There is no glory apart from Him. The glory of the Father resteth on Him. He, the Christ of God, prayed that the Father would glorify Him with Himself with the glory which He had with the Father before the world was.[4] His prayer was heard. And this glory He has given unto His Elect that they might be one, even as the Father and the Son are one. It is the indwelling of God which is the hope of glory.

The Elect of God should walk through the dreary paths of this life all aglow within. Like the men of Gideon who surrounded

[1] Judges vii. [2] Mal. iv. 2. [3] Phil. iv. 4. [4] John xvii. 15.

Jericho of old, the light should burn brightly within the earthen pitchers, so that when the last trump shall sound the mortal pitcher may be broken and the light of glory within shine brilliantly forth. Ah, this is the manifestation of the sons of God—the revealing of His Elect, the glorious revelation of the hidden brightness of the anointing within bursting forth! Shall not the dark places of the earth be enlightened thereby?

The mystery of the revelation of glory in the mystical body—Oh, the Elect of the Most High God, how would they leap for joy if they could but realise the glories set before them! No tongue can frame words expressive thereof. No eye hath seen, no ear hath heard, "neither have entered into the heart of man the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him."[1]

Let us then, as the Elect of God, strive to realise what the Lord has done for us—strive to reach forward unto the prize which He holdeth out to us. If we could but realise our heavenly standing—our glorious calling as the Elect of God, how lightly would the sorrows and troubles of this world rest upon us. We should ride lightly over the troubled waves of life, and find shelter and protection under the shadow of the wings of the Almighty.

We should indeed be most miserable had we but hope in Christ in this life. Here we have but the beginning of our life—the beginning of our hope. It groweth day by day by that which the Lord ministers in His Church. His sacraments feed, His ministers sustain and strengthen the hope which cometh of and resteth in Him.

We have *not*, then, in this life *only* hope in Christ, and therefore are we, as the Elect of God, most happy! The Lord's portion is ever joyful. In the land of the living their heart is glad and their glory rejoiceth; in death their flesh shall rest in hope. Like the Psalmist they can say, "Thou wilt show me the path of life; in Thy presence is fulness of joy; at Thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore."[2]

[1] 1 Cor. ii. 9. [2] Ps. xvi. 11.

Chapter X.

ON MAKING OUR CALLING AND ELECTION SURE.

"Give diligence to make your calling and election sure, for if ye do these things ye shall never fall."—2 *Pet.* i. 10.

These are the words of the Apostle Peter. The word sure here (βεβαίος) does not mean sure in point of knowledge, but sure in point of stability; that is, firm or steady. The Apostle is not calling on us to seek to ascertain that God has decreed our election; but he is desirous that we should be diligent to make it sure. And he shows, further, that if we are not diligent, and neglect the things whereof he writes, we may come short of our calling.

St. Paul uses a similar mode of expression with reference to salvation. In writing to the Philippians he says, "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling, for it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of His good pleasure."[1] These words we have already considered. They are evidently used in the sense of yield yourselves to and co-operate with Him who from the beginning of your being has been striving with you and working in you both to will and to do according to the mind of Christ. "We are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works which God hath before ordained (or prepared) that we should walk in them."[2]

In the passage in St. Peter the result of Election is made to depend on man's diligence, just as in the passage quoted from the Philippians the ultimate salvation of the individual is made to depend on his working it out, or carrying it into effect, in submission to God's working in him. Indeed, one of the best MSS. and several versions insert "by means of your works," which gives the true sense, as Bishop Ellicott points out, though the words are wanting in authority. It is but a reasonable inference from these passages that the essence of Election is not a decree compelling man's choice in some particular way, or shutting some up to salvation and passing by others, but that it is the expression of God's fixed approbation of those who submit to His heavenly grace and to His desire to make them partakers of Christ's glory.

[1] Phil. ii. 13. [2] Eph. ii. 10.

Jesus said, "Come unto me *all* ye that labour and are heavy laden and I will give you rest;"[1] and He also said, "Many are called, but few chosen."[2] And why is this? Is it not because when called they will not come unto Him, that they may have life? Is it not that they place their wills in opposition to His desire, and refuse His gracious invitation?

We read in the Revelation,[3] of those who are with the Lamb, that they are "called and chosen and faithful;" that is, they have been called and have obeyed, consequently they have been chosen, and having made their calling and election sure, are said to be faithful. This is the test of faithfulness—the making their calling and election sure.

The Lamb is *the* Elect one, and they have become Elect by being joined to Him. This way of becoming Elect and standing faithful is well described by the Apostle Peter in his first Epistle.[4] "Wherefore," says he, "laying aside all malice and all guile, and hypocrisies and envies, and all evil speakings, as new-born babes desire the sincere milk of the Word, that ye may grow thereby. If so be ye have tasted that the Lord is gracious. To whom coming as unto a living stone, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God, and precious, ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus Christ. Wherefore also it is contained in the scripture, Behold I lay in Sion a chief corner stone, elect, precious; and he that believeth in Him shall not be confounded. Unto you therefore which believe He is precious; but unto them which be disobedient, the stone which the builders disallowed, the same is made the head of the corner, and a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence, even to them which stumble at the word, being disobedient; whereunto also they were appointed. But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should show forth the praises of Him who hath called you out of darkness into His marvellous light."

Our course on earth here is justly compared by the Apostle Paul to a race in which we are engaged. All are engaged in this race, but one receiveth the prize.[5] Many are called to take part in the race. Some heed not the call; others begin the race but soon retire. It is the act of God that has fitted us to take part in this race, not our own act. It is His electing love. Only as His dear children, as joint heirs with Him in whom only we can conquer, can we be fitted to take part in this race. We may not run as uncertainly—we know what is the course we have to take. It is the narrow way. The beginning is the baptismal font; the end the manifestation of the sons of God in the glory of the resurrection.

[1] Matt. xi. 28. [2] Matt. xx. 16. [3] Rev. xvii. 14. [4] 1 Pet. ii. 1—9.
[5] 1 Cor. ix. 24.

The Lord has not simply given us the race to run and pointed out the way. He has traversed it Himself—He who is the Captain of our salvation. And He has given us the armour enumerated by the Apostle Paul wherewith we may fight the good fight of faith, and the ministries and ordinances of His house, by which we may be nourished and refreshed by the way and led on joyfully in the path of understanding.

The Apostle refers to the corruptible crown for which the Corinthians, we know, many times contended, and from this lesson, which must have gone home to them, he brings forth his argument as to the incorruptible crown—that crown of which, in writing to Timothy, he speaks when he says, "I have finished my course, henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me in that day, and not to me only, but unto all them also that love His appearing."[1] In each case there is no hope of victory without the most earnest and self-denying pains. If a man were about to contend in any trial of bodily strength, he would first train himself so as to be fitted in every possible way for the conflict. And during the actual contest he would disentangle himself of every needless incumbrance—would "lay aside every weight." It would not do to run as "uncertainly," *i.e.*, as one who had no certain purpose. Every nerve must be strained, every limb and every sense must be exerted to the utmost; there must be no hesitation, no looking back, no thought of yielding. Just so in the contest in which we are spiritually engaged. We must be earnest and diligent, we must keep under the body and bring it into subjection; for vain indeed it is for those who have begun in the Spirit to hope to be made perfect through the flesh. The latter is ever contending and desirous of the mastery, and our race is one life-long struggle. We are called to deny ourselves, to walk not in the vanity of the fleshly man, as those who are destitute of the light and life of God. All the lusts which deceive and carry away the natural man must be put off. We must be renewed in spirit and understanding by that "one Spirit" which evermore renews those who enter on the race by being baptised into the One Body. We are to run in the light of the heavenly vision, and in all points conform to the habits and course of life of that new man which, according to God, is created in righteousness and true holiness. The Judge stands at the crowning point, but He is the righteous One, the Holy One of God; Him we cannot see unless we be clothed with His righteousness and His spotless holiness.[2]

As we approach the crowning point we must become more and more like unto Him in whom we live and move and have our spiritual being.[3] It is His new creation, growing, perfecting,

[1] 2 Tim. iv. 8. [2] "Without holiness no man can see the Lord."—Heb. xii. 14.
[3] Acts xvii. 23.

until seeing Him, every one of them appearing before God in Sion, they are transformed into the likeness of His glory. It is that new man which is created according to God in righteousness and true holiness, and which is to shine in everlasting life, resplendent in the glory of God and of Christ.

Belief in what God has done and is doing is not enough. Faith is not all that God requires in His Elect. He looks for a perfect and willing sacrifice. Every exercise of man's will, whether in his actions or his words, or in the thoughts of his heart, must be directed to God, and be conformed to His mind, His will, and His pleasure. Perfect purity of thought, word, and action, perfect separation from the world and its vanities, entire dedication to the Lord, is what He seeks for in His Elect, in those whom He creates anew in Christ Jesus—the Holy one of God—in those who are engaged in the race through time to eternity. Divine strength is given, like the heavenly manna to the Israelites, day by day according to our wants, and must be sought by daily and habitual prayer. The man must pray literally without ceasing—that is, ever be in the spirit of prayer, relying with a constant dependence on God. His moral and spiritual power will be daily augmented, or, as the Psalmist expresses the same idea, his heart will be enlarged, and he will with ease and joy run the way of God's holy commandments.

Man cannot serve two masters. On the one hand is God with righteousness for his law, and in the obeying of whom is produced everlasting life; and on the other is Satan, whose mantle is shame, whose only reward after outward temporary pleasures have passed away is death, and separation for ever from the presence of God. One or the other must be served, and "to whomsoever ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey."[1]

We as the Elect of God have no choice in the matter; our choice was expressed by those who took on them to speak for us at the font when "being made free from sin and become the servants of God,"[2] we were placed by the goodness of the Lord in such a position as that we might bring forth "fruit unto holiness and the end everlasting life."[3] The narrow way has been chosen for us, and it is now our duty to walk therein. And in this life the narrow way is the path of joy as well as suffering. It leads to the haven of rest—to the mansions prepared for us in the heavens above. It is a way of peace, and what is so uplifting as a spirit of peace with God and man? Is it not everlasting life on earth to walk in the peace of God?

It is a common delusion to suppose that the ways of evil are pleasant and joyful, and the path of life, here at least, ever gloomy and dark. Count not the joys of the Elect of God here as nothing!

[1] Rom. vi. 16. [2] Rom. vi. 22. [3] *Ib.*

Do not suppose the followers of the Lamb to be gloomy men who know nothing of pleasure here—men who shut themselves out from all enjoyment whatever. There are the pleasures of the carnal man and the pleasures of the spiritual man, created after Christ in righteousness and true holiness. Those enjoyments which constitute the life and soul of the natural man are but trifling, vain, and empty pleasures of this world—some may be innocent and others not so. But even the innocent ones in themselves are to the natural man a snare, for they are his all. His heart is fixed on them and cannot ascend into the heavenlies with Christ, and with Him continually dwell. They form the treasures of the natural mind, and where the treasure is there the heart will surely be.

The Elect of God however, led by His Spirit, know how to use the glorious liberty which has been given them by their Father. They know that Christ has set them free. They despise not the good gifts which come from above; but they are not led away by them. They are loved only as they call forth the spirit of thankfulness and gratitude to God, or as they assist in drawing nearer the heart unto God, or teach more of His ways and purposes. For even earthly pleasures can work for good to those whose hearts are fixed where true joys are to be found. The desire of the heart is ever towards the loving hand which gives the pleasures when most seasonable, and suffers the gloom to overshadow for the better preparation for all that is to come from the inexhaustible treasury of His goodness.

By faith in Christ, through baptism, being born of God, we must grow in that life, proceeding from the state of babes in Christ, Christ being formed in us, until we attain to the measure of the stature of His fulness. At every stage grace is assisting, for no one can grow stronger in the Lord but by His sanctifying grace. It is the work of the Holy Ghost making holy God's elect children, that by growth in the power of the Second Adam the offending Adam within may be made weaker. And this is not effected by an annihilation of the will of man, not by impairing its power, but by establishing and confirming its strength. The operation of the Divine life within has the effect of expanding the free will, of directing it to worthy objects, of correcting its previous downward tendencies from heavenly objects, making the man to experience the blessedness of true freedom, that heavenly freedom which is the birthright of the children of God; and so long as the spiritual life is cherished within, mastery of temptation, sin, and rebellious passions is accomplished and the victory is assured.

The aspirations of the new life must be different from those of the old. One grows *from* God—day by day moving further away, until the marred image is lost in the deformity of a nature in which no longer can be traced one iota of the Divine likeness. The other grows *to* God—day by day moving nearer and nearer, led

by His Spirit, taught by His ministries, the image restored, the likeness revived, until finally made perfectly like unto Christ.

Necessarily, the course of life too of these running in opposite directions, must be different. The natural man knows nothing of the joys of the spiritual. They are beyond His apprehension, for the natural man knoweth nothing of the things of the Spirit of God by which the spiritual man is led.[1]

Let us then consider the claim which is on us. Let us take no lower view of our calling and standing than that on which the eye of the Almighty rests. If we are not *there* He sees us not in Christ—we are not in the christian's race. Our baptismal life, the life of Christ, is a life of holiness, because it cannot be otherwise, and how can we live this life if our words are not true and godly, if our thoughts be not chaste and pure, if our actions be not upright, righteous and holy? Each and all shall be one day brought to light—the light of the unimpeachable justice of God shall one day shine upon them—the hidden and guilty shall then be disclosed—no covering will avail in that day when the secrets of all hearts shall be revealed. Remember, even *now* we "are compassed about with a cloud of witnesses."[2] Their eyes are upon us, and ours must ever be on Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith. He, for the joy set before Him, endured the cross and despised the shame, and so must we. Let us look to the crown, for which we strive—the incorruptible crown that fadeth not away, and which is in store for those who faithfully endure unto the end.

If there were no possibility of falling after having been incorporated into Christ *the* elect One, then the exhortation of the Apostle Peter to "give all diligence to make our calling and election sure," by doing the will of God that we might not fall, would have been misplaced and meaningless. He shows conclusively that our continuance in the grace of God, in the race set before us, can only be maintained by doing His will. We must not only know the commandments, but we must keep them; not only know the right way, but walk therein.

What more beautiful and yet severe illustration could we have than that of our blessed Lord Himself, "I am the vine, and my Father is the husbandman. Every branch in Me (mark *in* Me) that beareth not fruit He taketh away, and every branch that beareth fruit He purgeth it, that it may bear more fruit."[3] And again, "If a man abide not in Me, he is cast forth as a branch and is withered, and men gather them and cast them into the fire, and they are burned."[4]

Does not this make it clear that though we may be united to Christ even as the branches to the Vine, yet may we be cast off as unfruitful and be separated from Him? And this is a very important scripture. It is one which should ever be kept and

[1] 1 Cor. ii. 14. [2] Heb. xii. 1. [3] John xv. 2. [4] John xv. 6.

treasured up in the heart of the Elect as a solemn declaration against the contrary assertions of many, and in the recollection of which we shall be the better able to work out our salvation "*with fear and trembling.*" Remember it was immediately after this lesson (or rather it comes in the middle of it) that our Lord said "*Now* are ye clean through the word which I have spoken unto you."[1] Every word which proceeds out of the mouth of God is purifying and cleansing, but He in this instance specially refers to the words enunciating the truth He had just uttered.

Nothing in what we have said militates against the doctrine, the blessed doctrine of the gospel, that our salvation is wrought out by the free grace of God. We glory in affirming that it is of God's free grace that such as we were "dead in trespasses and sins" are "saved and called with an holy calling," not according to our works, but according to the divine purpose and grace given us in Christ Jesus before the world begun.[2] Ten thousand worlds, it has been truly said, were we able to give them all, could not make satisfaction for any part of the smallest offence we have committed against God. And it is clear that neither faith, nor holiness, nor any nor everything we can do can give us any claim on the salvation of God. As one of the early reformers[3] says "all the martyrs that ever were, all the sacrifice of patriarchs that ever were, all the good works that ever were done, were not able to remedy our sins, to make satisfaction for our sins, nor anything besides, but this extreme passion and blood-shedding of our most merciful Saviour, Christ."

It was His free act, the cleansing and justifying us by the "washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost."[4] It is by His free gift that we are able, however imperfectly, to continue the conditions of our salvation. It is His free grace that teaches us to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts, and to live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world, looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of our great God and Saviour, Jesus Christ.[5] But God's grace operates through His appointed channels. He appoints certain means and through these He acts. Life, health, and strength are all His precious gifts—all are freely given. All our natural endowments come from Him, but they come through instruments and means which He has appointed. For instance, God gives the power of acquiring knowledge, but the means by which this knowledge is acquired cannot be ignored. And so it is in the spiritual. All these gifts come from above, but their maintenance and increase will depend on our use or abuse of them. If we would be blessed by them, and be the means of blessing others through them, we must be diligent in seeking and honouring the appointed means.

Now there are responsibilities resting on every individual

[1] John xv. 3. [2] 2 Tim. i. 9. [3] Latimer Ser. vol. 1. [4] Tit. iii. 5, 7. [5] Tit. ii. 12, 13.

member of the body to discern and apprehend the truth as it is in Jesus. The truth, however forcibly it may come to us, if not discerned, cannot become life to us and fruitful to others. It is according to our discernment of the truth, that those who are over us in the Lord are strong or weak. *They* are dependent upon the Church, and *she* is strong or weak as we are. There is a mutual dependence on each other. "*Now we* live," says the Apostle, "if *ye* stand fast in the Lord."[1] The strength of the weakest child cannot be despised. The little lips of the weakest child can utter sounds of praise, rejoicing to the heart of Jesus, gladdening to the angels above. Is it not written, "Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings Thou hast ordained praise?" Is there a Christian father or mother who has not experienced a refreshing in spirit, passing beautiful, when questioned on heavenly subjects by a little child? Is it not because *they* are members of the body—partakers of the Holy Ghost, and the very olive plants about the table of the Lord,[2] and in teaching them we are ministering to the Body of Christ!

All may bring, and it is their duty to bring, what light and learning they receive from above, unto the Lord that it may be used for the edification of the Church, for this edification and this building up is a work in which every one has his part. It is thus that the body maketh increase "unto the edifying of itself in love." This truth is perverted in the sects, where men and women are allowed to preach and teach, but it is nevertheless the perversion of a great truth. God's way is that all should be ready and willing, and should, in fact, communicate the truth which He reveals to them by His spirit; but it must be in His appointed way. This way was shewn under the law in the "meat offering" which the people presented unto the priest.

It is by thorough oneness of heart, unity of spirit, and unity of desire, that we can all grow together as the Lord would delight to see His Elect grow. We must not rest as we are. We must press forward, and what can have such a claim upon us as this—what so glorious—what so worthy of sacrifice as our heavenly calling? What are the things of this world viewed in the light of eternity? Many are called but few chosen; let us be of the few—of those who make their calling and election sure. Heed not being thought singular and perhaps foolish by the men of this world. The servant is not above his Lord. We cannot hope to escape scorn and derision from the men of this generation, but let us count it an honour to follow in the footsteps which our Lord has trod before. Let us remember that our mission is to shed the light of truth around us, to influence others by our life and conversation, giving the greater diligence to this as we see the day approaching.

We must not be conformed to this world. Our Lord says, "I

[1] 1 Thess. iii. 8. [2] Ps. cxxviii. 3.

pray not that thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that Thou shouldest keep them from the evil."

The cry of the day is that the Election should conform itself to the world. It is the old sin, springing into vigour, of mingling the earthly with the heavenly, a sin which can be traced at least to the Tower of Babel, and which caused God's judgment then to descend upon that generation. Perchance the sin may be repeated in the spiritual Babel in exaggerated proportions, and bring down again the judgments of God.

The Church is the aggregate of the Elect; she is a heavenly institution, a fact which seems to be ignored in these days when enthusiam too often takes the place of religion. Men's experience of their calling and conversion, and so forth, is put in the place of God's precepts and ordinances. Man's organization is put in the place of God's organization. Men and women take the places which none can truly and properly occupy but by God's own appointment. There is the sin of Korah. Who can feel surprise that the sacraments and ordinances of the Christian Church should be practically despised when the wretched twaddle of self-opinionated and self-righteous men and women is asserted to be the influence of the Holy Ghost?

The spirit of the age is the desire after novelty, and against this spirit God's Elect are called to stand. Every man thinks he has as good a right as another to take upon himself the ministry of the Lord and set himself up as a guide and teacher of others. It is the cry of the mob at the present day who are heaping to themselves teachers, and regarding neither the ordination of God, nor the ordinances of man, but saying that every man or woman who feels inclined to teach is qualified to be a minister, to stand up in the name of the Lord, and may expect the Holy Spirit of God to rest upon his or her ministration to build up the Church of the living God. "Ask for the old paths, where is the good way and walk therein"[1] is a precept the world considers adapted to a bygone age, but as unsuited to the present advanced state of civilization and religion.

In the midst of this feeling it is the duty of the Election—the Catholic Church—to bear her solemn witness to the truth of God. The old cry is raised that the Church is not in harmony and will not put herself in harmony with the "spirit of the age." Of course not; the Elect cannot be conformed to this world.

It is the desire of the evil one, finding expression through the lips of the mob, that she, the Bride of the Lamb, should be conformed to this world. From the days of old when our Lord compared the world of His day to the children in the market place who marvelled that the prophet that passed by danced not to their piping and mourned not at their lamenting,[2] from then till now

[1] Jer. vi. 16. [2] Matt. xi. 17.

the world has demanded the alliance of the Church and that her children should come under the bondage from which Christ has set them free. Was our Lord in harmony with the spirit of the age while on earth and among those who rejected Him—despised His mission and put Him to a cruel death? Were the Apostles of old in harmony with the spirit of the age when they went about with their very lives in their hands? Were the blessed martyrs whose faith withstood the most cruel of tortures which the ingenuity of man could devise in harmony with the spirit of their age? Their precious blood which watered the garden fresh of the Lord's planting crieth out from the ground in contradiction to the thought that *they* were conformed to this world. They lived and died opposed to the spirit of the age. They lived and died in the fear of the Living God in whose name they spoke and in opposition to the generation by which they were rejected and put to death. They overcame the age in which they lived by the patience of their suffering, and by the faithfulness of their testimony.

Let us not mistake; it is not, and never was, the duty of the Church or her children to be conformed to the spirit of the age. It is the duty of the Elect to shew the light of truth to the age—to utter the word of rebuke when necessary, but never to be conformed to the world around. The Church of the Living God is the mother of the Elect—as the dwelling place and Temple of the Holy Ghost she partakes of the unchangeableness of God. So far as she is Catholic the fashion of her countenance altereth not, for like her Divine Head, she is "the same, yesterday, to-day, and for ever." Her mission is to be in the world and yet not of it. All she has received from her Head she holds as a precious trust. Her faith, her hope, her doctrine, her organization—all have been fixed by the Unchangeable One, and may not be altered to suit the evil days. Were she to attempt to alter her doctrine to suit the philosophy of the day, or to modify it to meet the varying idiosyncrasies of men she would be unfaithful to her trust, and be no longer the "pillar and ground of the truth."

Finally, let us remember that the Lord is waiting for His Elect. He is "not slack concerning His promise as some men count slackness, but is long suffering to usward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance."[1] He sees that some have defiled their garments and have denied His name. He gives them space for repentance that they may return again to Him. He calls upon all to yield themselves to Him, that He may fit them for their eternal place in His everlasting kingdom. If they are not willing, if they set their own wills against His will and desire, they will find themselves passed by and others taking their place. The long-suffering of God waiteth now as in the days

[1] 2 Pet. iii. 9.

of Noah, but His purpose He will not delay for ever. As the remnant according to grace at the end of the Jewish dispensation was small and gathered speedily, so may the Elect be at the end of this. Let us beware. Let us profit by the examples set before us in Holy Scripture and take warning from the prophecies thereof. "He will finish the work and cut it short in righteousness, because a *short work* will the Lord make upon the earth."[1]

Separation must take place ultimately, and then those who have submitted to the Lord in the day of His fashioning and preparing of them as living stones, shall rejoice in the day of His power and glory. "Two shall be in the field, the one shall be taken and the other left; two women shall be grinding at the mill, the one shall be taken and the other left."[2] Yes, separation then indeed between those who have hitherto walked side by side in this world—no perfect union but in Christ. Let us then while yet it is called to-day, "give diligence to make our calling and election sure," for only those who do so now can escape the things that are coming upon the earth, only those can stand with the Lamb upon Mount Zion—only those enter into the highest joy of their Lord.

[1] Rom. ix. 28. [2] Matt. xxiv. 40, 41.

Chapter XI.

THE OPERATIONS OF THE HOLY SPIRIT NOT IRRESISTIBLE.

"Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God."—Eph. iv. 30.

The Apostle Paul in writing to the Ephesians says, "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are (have been ἐσφραγίσθητε) sealed unto the day of redemption," and to the Thessalonians he says "Quench not the Spirit."[1] There was then a danger of the Ephesians *grieving* and of the Thessalonians *quenching* the Spirit.

Free-will has been given to us that we may be accountable creatures; without it we should not be so, and it is in the exercise of this free will that we may either "work out our salvation with fear and trembling," we may co-operate with the grace of the Holy Spirit of God; or we may prevent His operations so far as we are personally concerned.

To suppose that the operations of the Holy Ghost are irresistible is a deadly error. God does not deal with His reasonable creatures as mere machines. While the Holy Spirit "prevents us with His most gracious favour and furthers us with His continual help," and while from Him we receive all our "sufficiency"[2] to do what is pleasing and acceptable to God, He never overrules our will or forces our actions. That by reason of the fall man is always inclined to evil, is a great truth never to be lost sight of. Though his will be free, yet it has a tendency to wickedness, and without the Divine aid man cannot fulfil the Divine all-righteous will. This is a doctrine most unpalatable to human pride, and has been opposed in all ages. First, by the Pelagians, then by the Socinians, and lastly by the Unitarians.

It is by grace that we are first inspired and moved to do any good thing. The Holy Spirit acts first by quickening in us the life of the Risen Head—renewing the Divine image marred by the fall and imparting a new principle of life higher and far more glorious than that lived by Adam in Paradise. Then He gently leads us in and out finding spiritual pastures for our souls, guiding us to the oases known only to God in the spiritual wilderness and gradually increasing our power of fulfilling the Divine law, counteracting

[1] 1 Thess. v. 17. [2] 2 Cor. iii. 5.

temptations—kindling faith in the heart, sustaining the hope of glory within, and strengthening that love of God as manifest in love to the brethren which is the evidence that we have passed from death to life.

He who "searcheth the heart," who "knoweth our down-sitting and our uprising, who understandeth our thoughts afar off;" who compasseth our path and our lying down, and is acquainted with all our ways, for there is not a word in our mouth, but lo, He knoweth it altogether,[1] is able so to operate as not to destroy the free-will of His own creature. He is able to influence the will, to suggest a gentle lead to such thoughts as may prove a safeguard in the hour of temptation, or even strengthen the weakness of resolution, arouse the purer and better feelings of our nature without violating the free agency of man or destroying that moral character of His government by which He rules His reasonable and accountable creatures.

How God disposes of man's free-will without imposing necessity upon him we may not be able to show, but that He does do so we may admit in faith. That grace can always be resisted is equally a truth of which every man, by sad experience, can furnish an example. He carries about with him, since his fall, a dreadful fund of evil propensities which inconceivably increase his desire to resist grace, but nevertheless, when it pleases God in infinite mercy to touch his heart He makes him do whatever He chooses, and in whatever manner, without this infallible operation of God in any measure destroying the natural liberty of man. As St. Augustine beautifully puts it, God changes the human heart by a heavenly sweetness of disposition imparted to it, which, overcoming the sensuality of the flesh, causes man, on the one hand, to perceive his mortality and nothingness, and on the other to discover the greatness and eternity of God; and produces a distaste for the pleasures of sin which separate him from incorruptible blessedness, till finding his supreme enjoyment in the God who attracts him, he inclines infallibly, and of himself, to this good by a bias entirely free, voluntary and affectionate, so that to be separated from it would be a grief and a punishment. Not that he becomes incapable of departing from it, or of departing effectually if he choose; but could he be so disposed when the will never propels him to do anything but what is most pleasing to him; and nothing pleases him so much as that single good which comprehends in itself all others? "Quod enim amplius nos delectat, secundum id operemur necesse est," as St. Augustine observes.

We have the consoling declaration that no temptation shall beset us "but such as is common to man (or rather as is measured to man's strength); but God is faithful, Who will not suffer us to be tempted above that we are able; but will, with the temptation

[1] Ps. cxxxix. 1-4.

also, make a way to escape, that we may be able to bear it."[1] As St. Chrysostom says, "For when He sees the burden too great for our strength, He stretches out His hand and lightens the temptation; but when He sees us, from indolence and neglect, giving up our salvation, and not willing to be saved, He leaves and forsakes us. For He does not force or necessitate; and as He acted with respect to instruction, so He acts upon this occasion. For He did not drag or compel those who were unwilling to hear, and went away: so He explained what was obscure and mysterious to those who were attentive. So it is with respect to actions, those who are senseless and unwilling He does not compel or force; but those who are, of their own accord, ready, He draws with great earnestness. Therefore Peter says, 'of a truth, I perceive that in every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted with Him.'[2] And the prophet says the same thing, 'If ye be willing and obedient ye shall eat the good of the land; but if ye refuse and rebel ye shall be devoured with the sword.'[3] Knowing, therefore, these things, that to will and to run is in our power, and that by willing and running we draw God to our assistance, and that having obtained His assistance we shall bring our affairs to a prosperous conclusion, let us rise, my beloved, and exert all our diligence in the salvation of our souls, that having laboured here for a short time we may enjoy immortal happiness to all eternity."[4]

It is clear that we must not wait in a condition of spiritual inactivity until we feel the influence of the spirit of God. We must be active. We must seek, or we shall not find, we must knock or it shall not be opened to us. He who says, "I will sit down and wait till I am irresistibly moved to faith in God" may sit on in darkness for ever. And he who having received the grace of God says, "I will rest content with what I have, and wait till I am irresistibly impelled forward," will find in the end that he has followed the example of the man who hid his talent in a napkin and made no gain, and that there is such a thing as inertness in spiritual growth which ends in destruction from the presence of God. If one thing is clearer than another from Holy Scripture it is this, that he who is not led on, who is not willing and spiritually active in being led on, by the spirit of God, will find he is passed by. God's purpose with His Elect moves ever onward, and if men refuse to be led onward, if they are not willing to be polished and shaped as living stones for their eternal places in His true Temple—to be led on to a perfect man unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ, they will be rejected and others will take their office!

God's dealings with the children of men—specially His Elect—

[1] 1 Cor. x. 13. [2] Acts x. 34, 35. [3] Is. i. 19, 20.
[4] St. Chrysostom Oper. Bend. Ed. vol. vi. p. 165.

are all in righteousness. His mercy and His love are put forth in perfect righteousness. We see this from many facts of Holy Scripture, and particularly in His dealings with His chosen people of old. When they had rebelled against Him, and were visited with His judgment, Moses confessed their sin before the Lord, and besought that they might be forgiven, saying, "Yet now if Thou wilt forgive their sin:—and if not, blot me I pray Thee out of Thy book which Thou hast written. And the Lord said unto Moses, Whosoever hath sinned against Me, him will I blot out of My book."[1]

The Lord's word is, "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy; and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion."[2] "I will be gracious to whom I will be gracious, and will shew mercy on whom I will shew mercy."[3] That is, He will bestow these according to His own glorious attributes. He will not shew mercy to the impenitent and unbelieving—for it would be contrary to His righteousness, and no man walking in the way of unrighteousness can be justified of God. The blessings of the Gospel must be sought, not according to the will of the flesh, nor of man, but according to the mind and will of God. Heavenly promises can only be inherited by walking in the ways of God.

Consider for one moment the dealings of God with Pharaoh. His was the case of a man setting up his own will against the will of God. He is given as a type of this form of character, and as a warning to men in all ages, demonstrating God's way of dealing with men of this stamp in vindication of His own righteous way. "For the Scripture saith unto Pharaoh, Even for this same purpose, have I raised thee up, that I might shew My power in thee, and that My name might be declared throughout all the earth."[4] We cannot say that Pharaoh was a man who had no grace from God; his is rather a case of a man who rejected grace. God saw that he would not hearken unto Him, nor let Israel go, and as Pharaoh would not humble himself nor submit himself to God that mercy might be shewn him, God magnified His great name in his destruction, using him as an example to illustrate the consequence of sin and as a warning throughout all ages. Pharaoh was bent on having no superior, even in God Himself; he exalted himself against God, and the way in which he was dealt with was a righteous way. The truth that Pharaoh hardened his own heart, as we have already explained,[5] must not shut out from us the truth, the solemn truth that where sin shews itself in determined opposition to God's will, the actors are liable to be judicially blinded and hardened, even by God, to their own destruction. "He hath mercy on whom He will have mercy, and whom He will He hardeneth."[6]

[1] Exod. xxxii. 32, 33. [2] Rom. ix. 15. [3] Exod. iii. 19.
[4] Rom. ix. 17; Exod. ix. 16. [5] Ante p. 213. [6] Rom. ix. 18.

God's foreknowledge of the wickedness of Pharaoh's heart to the last did not prevent Him dealing with him as a responsible creature, and had the king repented he would have obtained mercy. He did not repent, and God's righteousness was seen in his destruction.

A two-fold danger has to be guarded against. The one danger is, that of holding the influence of the grace of God to be so powerful as that no effort of our own is requisite to co-operate with it; and the other, that of placing too great reliance on our own efforts and attributing too little to the grace of God, without which all our efforts will be vain.

To guard against the first danger let us remember that God does not force His favours and His blessings on any man. On earth all His works of mercy and helping were to those who sought Him in faith. In heaven His ear is ever open to the cry of His children, and by those who seek Him He is ever found. He freely gives such preventing and assisting grace as will enable man "to will and do after His good pleasure," but He acts not by way of compulsion, and men may always, in the exercise of their free will, reject His grace, and grieve and quench His Holy Spirit.

It is true that "no man can come unto Christ except the Father draw him,"[1] and that if we would be faithful sons of God we must be "led by the Spirit;"[2] but at the same time a "reasonable" service is required of us, and the Apostle "beseeches us by the mercies of God to present our bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God."[3] These are the "free-will offerings" with which the Psalmist teaches us the Lord will be pleased.[4] God draws by His Word and the Holy Ghost, but it is man's duty to hear and learn and receive with joy the grace offered. "In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying 'If any man *thirst*, let him *come* unto Me and drink.'"[5] Grace is given to every man to come unto the Living Fountain if he be willing. If he quenches not the preventing action of the Spirit of God, he will feel that hungering and thirsting after righteousness which will lead Him to the Bread and Fountain of Life, but *he must come himself.* If he be willing to come, then the grace of God will assist him so that his feet shall not slide. But to wait till some unnatural and unlooked-for operation of the Holy Spirit is felt, which can be termed *irresistible*, is most dangerous and destructive to the Christian character. The fact is, probably in the majority of cases, that the grace of God is on the particular occasion irresistible is pure fancy; it is more probable that at that moment our wills by the grace of God are not in opposition to His influence, and the natural is, for the time, so subdued as to leave an entrance for the spiritual.

[1] John vi. 44. [2] Rom. viii. 14. [3] Rom. xii. i. [4] Ps. cxix. 108.
[5] John vii. 37.

We are warned not to "quench the Spirit,"[1] and that "if we do not like to retain Him in our knowledge, He will give us over to a reprobate mind to do those things which are not convenient."[2] And we are further warned to do no "despite to the Spirit of grace."[3] Therefore It may be despised, and if so It will depart like the glory from the temple which Ezekiel saw, and the last state of that man shall be worse than the first.

There can be no doubt that the power of receiving the grace of God in such a way as that it may fructify and bring forth good fruit, and the receiving it in vain—or choking up the seed of God with the follies of this life—lies to a great extent with the man himself; and as there must be a difference between those who receive it in the former way and those who receive it in the latter way, it cannot be contrary to the true doctrine of free grace to mark this difference. To those who make good use of the treasure entrusted to them by God as faithful stewards shall be given more abundantly, while those who receive in vain shall have taken from them that which they have despised or misused in that day when every man shall receive according to his works.

It is useless to endeavour to slur over the truth by saying that too much is here attributed to man. It is said an opening is made for man to boast. But is this really so? What is there to boast of in accepting the mercy that is offered,—in being led by the Spirit of God? Would the prisoner confined in the depth of a dungeon, on finding his chains thrown off and the door open, boast because he merely walked forth to light and freedom? The child of God works not out his salvation with boasting, but with "fear and trembling," something very much like the reverse of boasting. He knows to the last hour of his life that he has no stay but his God, no assurance but in the mercy and love of the Most High. He knows that it is God alone who worketh in him to will and to do according to His good pleasure,[4] and that without the aid of His Holy Spirit he will inevitably sink into ruin. Truly in the Scriptural doctrine there is no room for boasting; as St. Paul says, "It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay; but by the law of faith."[5] The fact is clear that the man who uses God's gifts in the service of his Master and Lord, who exercises those gifts with an eye solely to the glory of God, is a faithful steward; while the man who uses them in his own service and for his own glorification, or not at all, is an unfaithful steward. The capacity of being faithful comes from God; this He gives when He imposes the duty of service, and thus the difference between the stewards lies with themselves and not with God, for He wills that all should be faithful and reap the reward. As all comes from God—the treasure and the capacity to use it aright—

[1] 1 Thess. v. 19; Heb. iii. 12, xii. 3. [2] Rom. i. 28. [3] Heb. x. 29.
[4] Phil. ii. 13. [5] Rom. iii. 27.

there is in reality no room for boasting; and he who boasts is an unfaithful steward, for he takes to himself that glory which belongs alone to his Master, and to him the rebuke of the Apostle applies "Who maketh *thee* to differ from another?"[1]

This applies to the unfaithful steward, but not to the man who is making his boast in God, and who thus indirectly asserts his own faithfulness. There is a clear distinction between the talents entrusted to us and our faithfulness or unfaithfulness in the use of them, and St. Paul, in 1 Cor. iv. 1-5, fully recognises this distinction, and he there shows that although any difference in the talents entrusted was to be attributed not to the steward but to his Lord, yet there was in each recipient good ground for praise or blame in respect of the mode in which their gifts were exercised. So, in writing to the Galatians, the same Apostle marks the operation of the human power with the Spirit to produce good works. "Whatsoever," says he, "a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption, *and he that soweth to the Spirit* shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting."[2]

To guard against the second danger of which we have spoken above, that of relying too greatly on our own efforts, we must remember the Apostle's warning, "Let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall."[3] It is only as we know our nothingness, and as we walk in obedience and humility, that "we can do all things through Christ who strengtheneth us."[4] The Spirit of dependence on God was the principle which our first parents violated, and this has been the temptation of the natural man ever since. We cannot even pray to God acceptably without His Holy Spirit guiding us to His footstool, and leading upwards our aspirations to the throne of grace. The Psalmist, with spiritual insight, knew this truth, and therefore sang "Quicken us, and we will call upon Thy Name";[5] and again, "Lord, Thou hast heard the desire of the humble: Thou wilt prepare their heart, Thou wilt cause Thine ear to hear."[6]

It is an unquestionable principle that no step in spiritual progress can be taken by our own unaided strength, and that all our efforts are in vain without the assistance of God. Whenever the attempt is made in proud reliance on self, the result will be failure and bitter humiliation.

We are called upon to humble ourselves under the mighty hand of God, to yield ourselves to Him as clay in the hands of the potter, that the natural which is devoted to the service of Satan may be taken to pieces, and the spiritual, which is devoted to the service of God, may be formed to the glory of His Holy Name.

It is only as we submit in humility to be thus fashioned, as we

[1] 1 Cor. iv. 7. [2] Gal. vi. 7; see also 1 Tim. vi. 19. [3] 1 Cor. x. 12.
[4] Phil. iv. 13. [5] Ps. xxx. 18. [6] Ps. x. 17.

acknowledge our inability of ourselves and out of Christ to perform any work or service which can be acceptable to the Father, and proclaim our entire dependence on His aid and implore His assistance, that we can hope to be kept from the paths of the destroyer and uplifted on the path of righteousness and true holiness. But with this humility and dependence there must be no denial of the true position in which by the grace of God we have been placed; neither must the certainty of His Divine assistance induce us to relax our efforts or our vigilance.

The evil one goeth about as a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour, and we require not only all the weapons of active and defensive warfare of which the Apostle Paul speaks,[1] but to have them ever at hand, and to be strengthened by the Spirit of God in the successful use of them during our time of trial and probation here.

No exact line of demarcation can be drawn between the Divine influence and the effects of human exertion. It would be absurd to attempt it, for the operation of God's Holy Spirit is revealed to faith and not to sight. We know of His operation because it is revealed; but how and in what way He acts (which it would be necessary to know in order to define the exact limits of His action) is not revealed.

Our fields could no more bring forth their fruit without the sustaining power of the Almighty than our hearts could bring forth the fruit of good living without the aid of God's Holy Spirit. But who would consider this a good reason for the husbandman to abstain from ploughing and sowing. He is active first, and then, as S. James says, he "waiteth for the precious fruits of the earth, and hath long patience for it."[2] Though God is the giver, and His power produces the harvest, yet it is produced in accordance with His own wise laws. And the same principle holds good in spiritual life which results in the spiritual harvest, and it would be equally absurd were we to neglect the ordinary means of grace and attempt to stand still because we properly acknowledge the necessity of Divine aid in our walking aright.

There is, moreover, nothing inconsistent in this mode of co-operation, nothing but what is clearly warranted by the whole tenor of Scripture, nothing which detracts from the glorious and mighty attributes of God, or which destroys the freedom of the human will, or the moral responsibility of the creature.

Nothing is required from man but what he is able to give. God requires of him not "according to what he hath not," but according to that with which he has been endowed. The Holy Spirit rouses the exertions of the individual, keeps him in a state of spiritual activity, and makes it possible for him to make daily progress in spiritual life. The same Spirit encourages the Elect of God to

[1] Eph. vi. 17; 1 Thess. v. 8. [2] James v. 7.

seek continually at the fountain head for those perennial streams which make glad the city of God, and to look at every step of his progress to the Divine aid to sustain and support him in his daily warfare. The knowledge that the co-operation of the Holy Spirit is necessary encourages humility and vigilance, watchfulness and prayer. And, on the other hand, it discourages pride, self-reliance and independency of God. The Saviour is pointed to as the source of all life, strength, and growth—as the sustainer of all His creatures, and the light and joy of all His children. The Elect of God are led onward, ever onward, in patience, hope, and joy, until even by the hand of God Himself they pass into His own Paradise, where "they shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more, neither shall the sun light on them, nor any heat. For the Lamb which is in the midst of the Throne shall feed them, and shall lead them unto living fountains of water,"[1] and shall "satisfy them abundantly with the fatness of His house, and shall make them drink of the river of His pleasures."[2]

[1] Rev. vii. 14, 17. [2] Ps. xxxvi. 8.

Chapter XII.

THE ASSURANCE OF THE ELECT.

"*Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall.*"—1 *Cor.* x. 12.

The doctrine of the assurance of the Elect, as taught in Holy Scripture, is very comforting. We are taught that by baptism we have been numbered among the Elect, and that it is our Father's good pleasure to give us the Kingdom. No act of our own could have placed us among the Elect, no actions of our own can keep us there; but at the same time no angel, man or devil, can pluck us from the bosom of Jesus, in which His children have found their home.[1] We must, however, be careful that we check not the operation of the Holy Spirit, that we hinder not His work which is to carry us onward in the purpose of God, until at length we attain unto the promised inheritance.

By the assurance of the saints is usually understood the assurance or certainty of salvation. We must be careful when we admit this assurance as a truth of God that we do so in a qualified manner, so that we are not taken to admit that doctrine of personal assurance which by Calvin and his followers has been added to the gospel. Admitting it to be a criterion of a believer's actual enjoyment in God as applied to the present experience of the people of God, we must guard against the danger of presumptuous confidence and the drifting into the position of denying the possibility of finally falling from grace. Presumptuous confidence is abhorrent to the Lord, and the Apostle's rebuke is, "Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall,"[2] while, on the other hand, we are to have confidence in Him who maketh us to stand; for the same Apostle says, "Ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption whereby we cry Abba! Father! The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God."[3] Here is the testimony of our own spirit responding to the Spirit of God. It is indeed the assurance of the saints—one of those good things which He will not withhold from them that walk uprightly. The office of the Holy Ghost is to assure us of our adoption as sons,

[1] John x. 28, 29. [2] 1 Cor. x. 12. [3] Rom. viii. 15.

to bring to us that love which children must have for their Father, to give to us, even under the veil of earthly things, the foretaste of the glory to follow, to bring to the heirs of the kingdom an earnest of their everlasting inheritance. As Bishop Pearson says, "As therefore we are born again by the Spirit, and receive from Him our regeneration, so we are also *assured* by the same Spirit of our adoption, and because, being sons, we are also heirs, heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ, by the same Spirit we have the pledge or rather the earnest of our inheritance. For He which establisheth us is Christ, and hath anointed us is God, who hath also sealed us, and hath given the earnest of His Spirit in our hearts.[1] So that we are sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession.[2] The Spirit of God is given unto us in this life, though it have not the proper nature of a pledge,—as in the gifts received here being no way equivalent to the promised reward, nor given in the stead of anything already due,—yet is to be looked upon as an earnest, being part of that reward which is promised, and upon the condition of performance of the covenant which God hath made with us, certainly to be received."

Arminius taught a much safer doctrine on this subject than Calvin, and enunciated it with his usual solemn modesty. He considered that it is possible for him who believes in Jesus Christ to be certain and persuaded, and if his heart condemn him not, he is in reality assured that he is a son of God, and stands in the grace of Jesus Christ. He thought that such a certainty is wrought in the mind as well by the action of the Holy Spirit inwardly actuating the believer and by the fruits of faith,—as from his own conscience and the testimony of God's Spirit witnessing together with his conscience. He thought also that it is possible for such a person with an assured confidence in the grace of God and His mercy in Christ, to depart out of this life, and to appear before the throne of grace without any anxious fear or terrific dread, and yet this person should constantly pray, 'O Lord enter not into judgment with Thy servant!' And further, he considered that since 'God is greater than our hearts, and knoweth all things,' and since a man judges not his own self, this assurance could not be placed on an equality with that by which we know there is a God, and that Christ is the Saviour of the world. This is obvious; for faith in the existence of a God and in Christ as the Saviour of the world depend upon direct revelation apart from the application of any principle to any given condition of circumstances; but it is otherwise with the assurance of certainty of our individual salvation.

Grotius gives an excellent history of the doctrine. From it we may take the following as throwing light on the different modes

[1] 2 Cor. i. 21. [2] Eph. i. 14.

of assurance of salvation mentioned by early writers: "The ancient authors," says he, "appear to me to acknowledge three modes of being assured of salvation. (1) The first of them is an extraordinary one by revelation, which St. Augustine intimates is given to some men when he says, 'What man knows that he will persevere to the end in the exercise and progress of righteousness? unless through some revelation he be assured by Him who in His just and secret counsel does not instruct all men concerning this matter, but deceives no one.'[1] (2) The ordinary methods are two; of which the first derives its origin *from the time*, the other *from the degree of faith—from the time* a man who believes is assured of his salvation, when death is at hand, and a continuance of life is hopeless. For when a believer knows these two points, which from the sacred writings and with pious antiquity we defend against the Papists,—that is, when he knows that he believes, and that a believer is justified before God, and when these are the last moments of a believer, he knows, therefore, that he is dying in a state of grace and is thus assured of his salvation. In reference to this, when Prosper had declared predestination to be uncertain with us, he added, while we are exercised with the perils of the present life. (3) The other ordinary mode of assurance is from the degree of faith. For the ancients constantly affirm 'that the charity which never fails is perfect,' speaking according to the perfection of the present life; because, as the saying of St. Augustine is, 'In this life the *most perfect* charity has no place.' This saying of St. Jerome is very remarkable: 'The charity which was but a herb in Peter before he denied Christ, and which in every man springs up before it arrives at maturity, is lost and recovered before it attains to its perfection.' This is that root which St. Augustine says, 'cannot possibly be dried up, even under a burning sun.' Nor does that Father seem to have had respect to anything else, when he asks, 'Who among the multitude of believers may presume that he is in the number of those who are predestinated?' For, by mentioning *the multitude of believers*, he apparently excludes some few and select persons. Besides these three plenary modes of assurance, there are other inferior degrees. For, as St. Bernard himself acknowledges with all the ancients, 'God has not left his own Elect in this life without a testimony of consolation. But this testimony is the more certain and assured, according to the greater and more numerous exercises of their piety. This is clearly demonstrated by the Holy Scriptures when they command us to make our calling and election sure or certain, by faith, virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, and charity.'[2] On this account St. Augustine proclaims with all antiquity, 'Fear is diminished exactly in proportion to the increase of charity.'"

[1] City of God, xi. 12. [2] 1 Pet. i. 5-10.

The Holy Spirit is ever ready to cheer and guide onward the Elect—the sons and daughters of the Lord God Almighty—ever ready to pour forth grace, comfort, and strength. Is this not the very glory of the dispensation? Is not the work of the Holy Ghost *in* man, the very carrying into completion the Incarnation—the manifestation of God in flesh? "He dwelleth *with* you, and shall be *in* you,"[1] was the promise of our Lord the night before He suffered. Was He not looking to the life and power which should be brought to us by the Holy Ghost when our Lord said, "It is expedient for you that I go away?"[2] Our Saviour died that our reconciliation with the Father might be completed, and He ever liveth to make intercession for us. He was raised for our justification, and at His ascension entered upon that mighty work of pleading the merits of His blessed sacrifice—presenting His body as the Lamb as it had been slain, before the Throne of God, that the full benefits of what He had effected for us might be made manifest to us and ever flow down upon us.

There was, too, a work for the Spirit of God to accomplish, a work which could not be effected until the Son of Man had received as a gift the Holy Ghost for us.[3] "Touch me not," He said to Mary, "for I am not yet ascended to My Father."[4] Does this not tell of a closer union, a closer communion after His ascension than could be effected before? "Touch me not *now*, but ye shall be enabled to do so after I have ascended to My Father," is the purport of our Lord's words. And is this not the case? Had not the beloved disciple a nearer connection with our Lord after the day of Pentecost than he ever had before, even while resting in the bosom of His dear Master and Lord?

It was indeed expedient, as our Lord said, that He should go away. He went to be glorified with the glory which He had with the Father before the world was, that He might fulfil the promise He had made to His disciples of enduing them with power from on high.[5] He received that power on high, not as God, but as Man, entering into the holiest of all with His own blood.

From the day of the giving of the Holy Ghost the work of preparing a Body, an Election to be indwelt of God, has been going on. On that day a unity, a oneness, impossible before, was effected between God and man. A unity which can be likened only unto the Vine and the branches—the Head and the Body. And this was effected by the giving of the Holy Ghost—the Comforter—the Spirit of Him who hath ascended to the right hand of the Father—the Spirit of Jesus Christ made Lord. He is to act as the Spirit of the Man Jesus Christ in men—to dwell *in* them—to conform them to His image—the image of *the Elect One*—to shed abroad the love of God in their hearts, to do the

[1] John xiv. 17. [2] John xvi. 7. [3] John vii. 39; Eph. iv. 8. [4] John xx. 17. [5] Luke xxiv. 49.

works of God in the members of the mystical body; as the members of the natural body of Jesus did His will on earth.

The Holy Ghost came, then, to call an Election out of the nations of the Earth, to constitute a Body of which the Lord Jesus Christ should be the Head, and by which the Will of Christ, the love of God, and the wisdom of the Almighty, should be revealed and made known to the whole creation of God. The acts which the Elect do, should be the acts of Christ in them. And if the Church, as the true Election, be the "fulness of Him that filleth all in all,"[1] His love should be seen in her, His holiness should be manifested in her, His power and glory felt.

By the operation of the Holy Ghost we are joined to Christ. By the operation of the Holy Ghost in our hearts we are able to say "Abba Father." He brings to us the resurrection life of Christ, He gives us the earnest of the inheritance, for "the Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God, and if children then heirs, heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ."[2] He is the pledge that we shall be glorified with Christ in that day when the Risen Lord shall no longer be hidden in the secret of God's presence, but shall be manifested in the glory of His Father, and in His own glory, and of the holy Angels.

All proceeds from the love of God, who, "Of His own will, begat us with the word of truth."[3] His own free act! We did not ask Him. He was found of those who sought Him not, who were not seeking Him, when He of His own free grace made us, as it were, the first fruits of his creatures; "being born again," as St. Peter says,[4] "not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever." Thus men become, indeed, God's creatures, not merely by creation, but by adoption, being begotten from the dead in the waters of baptism by the operation of the Spirit of God and the word of truth.

And the Lord expects that those for whom He has done so much should respond to His gracious gifts and calling. He looks to them to exercise aright the freewill with which He has endowed them, and which He has sanctified by the sprinkling of the blood of Christ. And yet the Lord must not be denied His true and proper glory, because He has left something for us, something in our power to do. Man is, on the one hand, urged to exercise His freewill, to put forth all the powers given to him, and on the other warned most solemnly not to put trust in himself. God will preserve him from falling so long as he remains faithful and obedient, but no longer. At no step of our career can we trust to ourselves alone. "Thus saith the Lord, cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm."[5] But "Blessed is the man that

[1] Eph. i. 23. [2] Rom. viii. 16, 17. [3] James i. 18. [4] 1 Pet. i. 23. [5] Jer. xvii. 5.

trusteth in the Lord, and whose hope the Lord is; for he shall be as a tree planted by the waters, and that spreadeth out her roots by the river, and shall not see when heat cometh, but her leaf shall be green; and shall not be careful in the year of drought, neither shall cease from yielding fruit."[1]

Truly, if we trust to anybody or anything, past, present, or future, but God Himself, who is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever, we merely delude ourselves. We trust to a broken reed. We poor weak creatures change with every wind, strong to-day, weak to-morrow—like Peter on the water, we walk one step and we sink another—all our comfort is this, our strength and standing is not founded on ourselves, but on the rock whereon we are built, and on the power of God whereby we are kept through faith unto salvation. A vivid picture of the person who is trusting in the Lord is drawn by the prophet. He is a tree planted by a river, and that river is the good will, the love of God. He is continually, as the mind of God comes forth in God's actions, receiving the waters of the river. A tree planted by a running stream, receiving continual nourishment from the waters of the stream, and independent of the vicissitudes of weather—not liable to be parched by drought. So God calls His elect to live by the everflowing stream of His own love—calls them to know that love in the greatness of the calling wherewith He had called them, that they should be heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ. "It doth not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that when He shall appear, we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is."[2]

Our trust must be in God alone, and in His loving and watchful care over us. "Being confident of this very thing that He which hath begun a good work in us will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ."[3] It is only when we so trust that we can be like that tree planted by a river and whose leaf shall be green, that we can be clothed with that fine linen, clean and white, which is the righteousness of saints.

The beginning of our confidence is trust in God—*then* we commence the Divine life. While we abide in that trust all is well; no shaft of the evil one can wound us, no temptations of the world or the flesh can bring us into condemnation; but in the moment in which we cease to have this simple trust in God Himself, and begin to look upon our fruits of faith and draw comfort from them, instead of deriving all our peace from the name of God as revealed in Christ Jesus, then we are trusting to our own righteousness, and we shall fall either under the darts of the evil one or under the dominion of the allurements which the pleasures and follies of this world offer.

That chosen and elect vessel of the Lord who taught most of Election and Predestination said, "I keep under my body and

[1] Jer. xvii. 7, 8. [2] 1 John iii. 2. [3] Phil. i. 6.

bring it into subjection lest that by any means when I have preached to others I myself should be a castaway."[1] He knew that except he kept under his body he should be a castaway, that except he abode in Christ he should be a castaway, that except he walked with God in the spirit he should not attain that crown of glory for which he looked. He trusted to God to give him strength to keep under his body, and he trusted to Him who never yet failed man in the hour of his need, with what result we may well divine.

The Lord "withholdeth no good thing from them that walk uprightly"[2]; and if so, then the power of continuing to walk uprightly shall not be withheld from them. In other words "to him that hath shall be given"[3]; the righteous "shall hold on his way, and he that hath clean hands shall be stronger and stronger."[4] And, as Solomon says, "The path of the just is as the shining light, which shineth more and more unto the perfect day."[5] When "cares like a wild deluge come and storms of sorrow fall," the child of God relies on the assurance that "all things work together for his good," and knowing that God is "for him" he cares not what man can do against him. He knows that whatever pertains to life and godliness, grace and glory, this life and that to come, is all laid up in Christ. Being renewed in the spirit of his mind he looks forward to the inheritance of the saints in light as the consummation of his brightest hope. But he sometimes fears lest he should come short of the rest that remains for the people of God; not that he fears the faithfulness of God to His gracious promises, but he doubts his own fidelity to God—conscious of the deep depravity of the human heart, and of the cunning craftiness of his many spiritual adversaries, whereby they lie in wait to deceive, if it were possible, the very Elect; he fears lest he should draw back to perdition instead of holding on his way and waxing stronger and stronger.

Indeed, so long as we have faith and assurance in God, and walk as becometh His dear Elect children, we need have no fear; for such, and for such only, is the doctrine of final perseverance a truth. For faith in Him is founded on a rock, which wind and waves can never break; while it stands there, it stands secure, for "he that trusteth in the Lord shall be as Mount Zion, which cannot be moved."[6] "The mountains shall depart and the hills be removed, but My kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of My peace be removed, saith the Lord that hath mercy on thee."[1] How animating in our Christian walk, how reviving in the dark and difficult paths of it, to have God's promise that His kindness shall not depart. How pleasing is it

[1] 1 Cor. ix. 27. [2] Ps. lxxxiv. 11. [3] Matt. xiii. 12. [4] Job xvii. 9. [5] Prov. iv. 18.

[6] Take the advice and follow the example of St. Paul, 1 Cor. ix. 24-27, and also 2 Tim. ii. 3-5, 1 Tim. vi. 11, 12; and the words of our Lord, "Continue ye in my love. If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love," John xv. 9, 10.

to go on in our warfare by faith, casting all our care upon Him who careth for us. How delightful is it to trust His promise, and daily to find it made good. "Ye are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation."[2] This is the assurance of the Elect—this their strong consolation amidst the trials and difficulties of their walk. They stand by faith, and that faith should lead them to rest safely on the promised assistance of Him who has said, "I will never leave thee nor forsake thee."[3] He alone can and will hold them up in His paths, that their footsteps slip not. He will preserve them from all evil. "The Lord shall preserve their going out and their coming in from this time forth and even for evermore."[4] Their hope is to be preserved by the goodness and mercy of the Lord which followeth them all the days of their life.[5] Though they walk through the valley of the shadow of death, He is their light and glory, His rod and staff shall comfort them, and they shall be made pillars in the temple of their God and go no more out.[6]

No doubt assurance of success elevates the spirit and courage of a man; but it must be assurance not irrespective of faith. It must be according to the revelation of God. No man, we know, is crowned except he strives lawfully; and it is also true that that which tends to make a man steadfast and immovable, and always to "abound in the work of the Lord,"[7] is not the fear of miscarriage and losing all at last, but faith and a *certain knowledge* that his "labour shall not be in vain in the Lord."[8]

But assurance must not make us callous and indifferent. We must remember that we are specially warned by the example of the Jews of old, (1 Cor. x.) that we may fall away notwithstanding all our precious privileges and blessings. Although God's chosen people were *all* baptised unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea, and *all* ate the same spiritual meat, yet they followed not on in the purpose of God, but fell from their standing and were overthrown in the wilderness. And the lesson is indeed needed. Because of unbelief they were broken off the root, and if God spared not the natural branches, let us be not high minded, but fear lest He spare not those who (not being natural branches, but grafted in) can stand by faith and grace alone.

Too great confidence in the flesh was the sin of the Israelites. They all stood in the same grace, though not all attained the prize. Their history is referred to as a type of ours; they were all baptised, they all ate spiritual meat and drank spiritual drink, and so we find ourselves standing in the baptism which saves us, and fed by that meat and drink, which is truly the Bread divine and the immortal Wine. As truly as the Israelites of old were delivered through the Red Sea from literal Egypt, have we been delivered, as the

[1] Is. liv. 10. [2] 1 Pet. 1 5. [3] Heb. xiii. 5. [4] Ps. cxxi. 8.
[5] Ps. xxiii. 6. [6] Rev. iii. 12. [7] 1 Cor. xv. 58. [8] *Ib.*

Elect of God, from the spiritual Egypt—the bondage of the flesh. As they were knit to Moses, so are we to Christ.

We need not refer more fully to the fall of those who in their deliverance were fed with heavenly food, and yet were not able to stand in the day of trial. They thought they had been led into the wilderness to die there; they doubted the faithfulness of Him who had called them. Let us not fall into a similar sin. Let us know that the wilderness is the way only into the land of promise, the lowly way, that we *must* suffer with Him that we may be glorified together.[1] And as we are faithful in the wilderness so shall we pass the Jordan of the First Resurrection into the heavenly Canaan.

In the passage in the Epistle to the Corinthians which we are particularly considering we are taught to distrust ourselves that we may be the more dependent upon the Lord and Giver of Life—the source of all our happiness and joy—the Way, the Truth, and the End.

But at the same time we are not encouraged to deny our calling, or to fear to stand firmly where God has placed us. For the humility which would make us fear to take the high position in which He has placed us, is the first step in the descent downwards to shame. We must know that we are accepted in the Beloved, seen in Him by the Father's eye, and therefore cleansed, righteous, and holy, so far as we abide in Him. Union with Christ is our safeguard. If any man can in his own strength occupy the position he does as the Elect of God, then Christ has died in vain.

To doubt of our forgiveness and cleansing by the blood of Christ is to doubt the virtue of His sacrifice—to doubt the promise and the faithfulness of God. The faith of the baptised man should rest in the immovable Rock. From the moment of our baptism and ever onward till the separation of soul and body, we ought to look upon our body as a pure and cleansed substance inhabited by the Holy Ghost, and by Him empowered to live the life of Christ and keep the commandments of God blameless. We should be at peace with God through the imputed righteousness of Christ, and be sanctified unto all obedience by the indwelling of the Holy Ghost.

If we think to stand in our own strength we fall. Union with Christ is our only support. Christ must be formed within, revealed in every thought, word, and action now here on earth, until later we shall be changed into the likeness of His glory. This is the calling of the Elect—this is "Christ in us the hope of glory."[2]

One of the far-reaching objects for which the Son of Man suffered was to give force to the human will against the law of the flesh and the world, to condemn sin in the flesh, and to overcome the world. This was effected by the presence—by the union

[1] Rom. viii. 17. [2] Col. i. 27.

of the Word in flesh. And the presence of Christ within us *now* is as necessary as ever in order that we may achieve the same supernatural work of conquering in the fight.

Therefore let none fear to stand with assurance in the place in which God hath put him. What he is called upon to do is to recognize the free gift of God, and, at the same time, not attempt to cast off his responsibility. He must remember, that though each step on the upward ladder which takes us nearer to the haven of rest, the appointed place of God's dear children, places a greater gulf between us and the point whence we started, yet, as the glory to which we ascend is greater, so the danger of our fall is more serious; for, as the Apostle says, "It is impossible for those who were once enlightened and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away to renew them again unto repentance."[1]

Let those who have been exalted into heavenly places, planted in the Courts of the Lord's House, surrounded with every spiritual blessing, beware. Let them not become dazzled with the light which cometh from the presence of God and which the Evil One ever strives to make injurious to them. Remember, light is not power. It makes clear the way—it points to the good, and at the same time reveals the hidden mystery of uprising iniquity, but it imparts no strength save as ministered in the hands of those of the Lord's appointing. What help is it to the weary and wounded traveller to see in the far distance a place of refuge to which he knows his own strength could never bear him?

Let none be wise in their own conceit. Let no man be puffed up with what he is or has received. The gift he discerns with mortal eye is as nothing to what he has really received and yet knows nothing of. What can we understand of that great gift of God to all in Christ? The gift of life—eternal life in Jesus Christ, the mystery hidden from all eternity, revealed personally in the man Christ Jesus, manifested and brought to light in the Gospel, and declared by those who were sent forth to declare Him who is the Resurrection and the Life.

Every gift of God has its appointed use,—use and exercise in the Body of Christ. All are held in trust, received as stewards; all are for the good of the whole and not merely the welfare and blessing of the individual. All are for edification and building up, for the gifts of God cannot scatter. All must be brought and laid at the Apostles' feet in spirit, that by them (who in this sense stand as a type of all ministry) they may be used for the glory of God and the blessing of His people. The ministries and ordinances of God are some of our surest defences in the day of battle; they are truly the walls of refuge which the Lord hath

[1] Heb. vi. 6.

erected around His Elect saints. For He has not only given them His Holy Spirit to enlighten their understandings, but He has set them under ministries and ordinances in His Church by means of which He reveals His mind and will. He has set them as means of blessing, as safeguards for His people, as instruments and channels to express His will and impart His grace, that the whole body by joints and bands, having nourishment ministered and knit together, may go on to perfection, increasing with the increase of God.[1]

Here is the power of standing—here is the path of safety—having respect unto the ordinances of the Lord, seeing Him in them, and seeking His blessing through them. They are truly the walls and bulwarks of Zion, into which the "righteous enter and are safe,"[2] preserved in Christ Jesus, kept by the mighty power of God through faith unto salvation,[3] even unto that salvation with eternal glory, ready to be revealed in the last times.

This is the assurance of the Elect in the last days. This is the present assurance of the saints of the Most High God when Satan cometh as an angel of light and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness.[4] We are told that there shall be false Christs and false prophets, and they shall show great signs and wonders, "insomuch that, if it were possible, they would deceive the very Elect."[5] And why is it so hard? for the expression "if it were possible" goes no further than this, as we have before explained. Are they placed quite beyond the reach of temptation. No. It is because they are walking in the ordinances of the Lord, and therefore He Himself is their defence. It is not possible to deceive those who "walk with God"; theirs is the joy, like Enoch's, of translation.

To walk with God is the calling of the Elect. They are called to tread the narrow path, for this is the only true following of Christ—this is the only way of God's Elect. No man can have eternal life except in this way, for eternal life is the end thereof. There is no substitute for this way—no path leading to the same goal. Men have been attempting to find some substitute, some way of their own which should produce the same result, and lead to the same end—the Paradise of God—but all in vain.

If we would stand firm, our confidence must ever rest in God; we must lay hold of the horns of the altar—depart not in spirit day nor night from the sanctuary of refuge in which the goodness of the Lord has placed us. Ah! those Cherubim with flaming swords, they now guard with eager love the Elect of the Living God, as they journey onward to the tree of life which groweth in the midst of the Paradise of God.[6]

[1] Col. ii. 19. [2] Prov. xviii. 10. [3] 1 Pet. i. 5.
[4] 2 Thess. ii. 10. [5] Matt. xxiv. 24. [6] Rev. ii. 7.

of the Word in
is as necessary
supernatural
Therefore
which God
recognize
to cast o
each ste
haven of
greater
the glo
more s
wh

T. SOWLER AND CO.,
PRINTERS, CANNON STREET,
MANCHESTER.

THE BIBLIOGRAPHY

OF THE

FIVE POINTS

AND

SUBJECTS CONNECTED THEREWITH,

BEING A LIST OF WORKS ON PREDESTINATION, ELECTION, REPROBATION, ORIGINAL SIN, THE FALL, FATE, PROVIDENCE, PRESCIENCE, THE ORIGIN OF EVIL, GRACE, REDEMPTION, FREE-WILL, NECESSITY, FINAL PERSEVERANCE, AND ASSURANCE,

WITH

BIOGRAPHICAL AND OTHER NOTES.

INTRODUCTORY NOTE.

THE Author has included in the Bibliography not only works on the Five Points, but also works on subjects immediately connected therewith, as for instance works on Fate, Providence, Prescience, Grace, Redemption, Necessity, Cause of Evil, The Fall, Assurance, &c.

Where the collected works of an author have been catalogued, or the particular work has been mainly on a different subject from any of those in the list, and the writer has only incidentally touched on one of the subjects included therein, the particular portion of the work where information may be found is usually pointed out.

The first editions are catalogued except where otherwise noted, and in the majority of cases the various editions stated. Notes have been added occasionally of a Biographical character, or with the object of indicating the views of the particular writer, and any special circumstances contributing to enhance the value of the work have been notified.

Works on the Bull Unigenitus, the Confessions of Faith generally, and the Formula Concordiæ, have not been catalogued, nor have works on the discussions between the Jesuits and Jansenists on the *discipline* of the Church. A very fine collection of these latter works will be found in the National Bibliotheque, Paris, such collection having formed part of the Library of the King of France. In short the Jansenists have not been followed to Holland, neither has their development into the Port Royalist been traced. It may be well to mention that there are some subjects somewhat allied to those included, which have been regarded as outside the limit which circumstances required the compiler to lay down for himself. Such are works on Faith, Salvation, The Atonement, Baptism, Regeneration, Justification, and such like.

The titles of the more important works catalogued have been given in full, particularly the earlier and rarer books, while those of lesser importance, or more modern, have been occasionally shortened.

A large proportion of the works catalogued have been personally inspected; and many of the rarest are in the Author's own library. No pains have been spared to make the list as complete and perfect as possible, but it need hardly be said that when its vast range of subjects is considered, the author would not for one moment pretend that he could not have considerably enlarged the list, had he been willing to expend the requisite labour. As it stands, he apprehends it is the largest collection of the kind ever brought together, and he ventures to hope that at least every work of importance will be found included.

The Author has to thank Mr. C. W. Sutton, Chief Librarian of the City of Manchester, for kindness in directing him to valuable sources of information, and generally for facilitating the consultation of various works of bibliographical importance. His thanks are also due to Mr. J. Taylor Kay, the courteous custodian of The Owens College Collection, and the Authorities of this College for special facility in consulting works of reference therein.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

1467. **Augustin** (S.) De Civitate Dei. fol. *Romæ* (In Monasterio Sublacensi).
First Ed., very rare, see Hain, 2046. Sold for £90 in Sunderland sale. In the copy in the Brit. Mus. under the colophon are the syllables God. al; which it is said are wanting in some copies. Numerous other Eds., *Romæ*, 1468, fol., sold for £111 in Sunderland sale; 1470, fol., sold for £37 in same sale; 1482, fol.: *Strasburg* [1468], fol.; *Sublicao*, 1469, fol.; *Venet.*, 1470 (an Ed. not mentioned by Hain), sold for £42 in Sunderland sale, where a copy on vellum fetched £280; 1475, fol.; 1486, 4to; 1488, 1489, fol.; *Argent*, 1488, fol.; *Mogunt*, 1473, 1475, 2 vols. fol.: *Neapoli*, 1477, fol.; *Bas.*, 1479, 1489, 1490, 1499, 1515, 1522, 1570, fol.; *Paris*, 1479, fol.; *Lovanii*, 1484, 1488, 1495, fol; *Westfalensis*, 1788, fol; *Argent.*, 1494, fol; *Friburga*, 1494, 2 vols. fol.; *Lugd.*, 1520, fol.; *Genev.*, 1622, 2 vols. 8vo; *Francof. ac Hamb.*, 1661, 4to: Recent Ed., *Lips.*, 1825, 1863, 2 vols. 8vo; 1877, 2 vols. 12mo; *Paris*, 1838, 2 vols. 4to; *Coloniæ*, 1850, 2 vols, 8vo; a compendium by Maioranis (F. de), *Venet.*, 1489, see Hain, 10,533. In French, *Abbeville*, 1486, 2 vols. fol., very rare, being first book printed at this place, sold for £11 15s. in Sunderland sale; *Paris*, 1531, 2 vols. fol.; 1570, 1585, fol.; 1601, 2 vols. 8vo; 1636, 1655, fol.; 1665, 1667, 1675, 2 vols. 8vo; 1736, 4 vols. 12mo; 1838, 8vo; 1842, 2 vols. 12mo; 1846, 3 vols. 8vo; 1853, 2 vols. 12mo; 1854, 3 vols. 18mo; 1855, 4 vols. 12mo; *Bassani*, 1796, 4to; *Bourges*, 1818, 3 vols. 8vo, in Italian; *s.l.* [1475], fol.; 1480, fol. (see Hain, 2071, 2072, 2074); *Venezia*, 1473, fol.; 1742, 2 vols. 4to; in English, with comments of Vives by J. H[ealey], 1610, 1620, fol., Bks. 11, 12, 13, and 14, by T. A. Walker, *Lond.*, 1871, 8vo; by Dods, *Edinb.*, 1881, 2 vols. 8vo.

[1470]. **Disputatio** s. Trinitate super redemptione humani generis. [*Coloniæ*].
See Hain, 6278, 6279.

1471. **Andrianus Carthusiensis.** Liber de Remediis utrius que fortunæ.
2 Ed.; 1st Ed. see Hain, 93—96; Other Ed. *Argent.*, 1474; *Lovan.*, 1471, 4to.

1472. **Theramus** (Jac. de) Dialogus de Redemptione humani generis. *August.*

——— **Catharine of Siena.** Libro de la diuina providētia. Cōposito in ul 'gare de la Seraphica uergene sācta chaterina da Siena suore del terzo ordiē d' sācto Dominico.
fol. *Sine notâ* [*Bononiæ*].
Editio Princeps, from the press of Azzognidi, the first printer of Bologna. It has neither pagination nor signatures, and is in double columns of 40 lines each, see Hain, 4689. Other Eds., *Venet.*, 1482, 1483, 1494, 4to; "*con figuri*," *Venezia*, 1494, 4to; *Brixiæ*, 1496, 8vo; *Venet.*, 1547, pp. 293, 8vo; 1611, 8vo; *Ingols.*, 1583; *Colon.*, 1601. The Authoress was an Italian, d. 1380, aged 33, canonized 1461.

1473. **Sixtus IV., Pope.** Tract. de futuris contingentibus. fol. *Romæ.*
See Hain, 14,800.

——— **Ruvere** (Franc. de) Tractatus de sanguine Christi, de potentia Dei, et de futuris contingentibus. fol.
Another Ed., *Nuremb.*, 1474, fol.

1474. **Gorichen** (Hen. de) Tract. de prædestinatione et reprobatione divina, &c. *Esslingæ.*
Excessively rare. Never met with a copy. See Hain, 7805; Panzer, i. 380. The printer was Conr. Fyner.

[1475]. **Felicianus.** De divina prædestinatione, providentia, meritis, gratia, &c. fol. [*Aug. Vindel.*]
Three Ed. appeared before 1486, the two first without name of place or date, but printed at Memningen by Alb. Kunne. The 4th Ed. Memningen, 1486, 4to. 5th, under the title "De Divina prædestinatione," appeared *S. L.*, 1495, 4to. See Hain, 6950—6954.

1476. **Gansfortius** (Basil) De Providentia Divina.
See Arpe, *Theat. Fati*, 51; not mentioned by Hain

1477. **Lotharius.** Liber de miseria humanæ conditionis. fol. *Nuremberg.*
This is the 1st Ed. with date. Earlier Ed. had appeared, see Hain, 10, 209—10, 214. Later Ed., *Paris*, 1480, 4to; 1483, 4to; 1494, 1495, 8vo; *Barcinone*, 1489, 4to; *Colon.*, 1496, 8vo. The Author was Pope Innocent III.

1478. **Seneca** (L. A.) Opera. fol. *Taruisii.*
De Providentia, other Ed. *Neapoli*, 1484, fol.; *Lyptzick*, 1495, 4to; per Arnoldum de Colonia; *Lyptzick*, 1498, 8vo, per C. Racheloffen. In works, *Paris*, 1607, fol.; 1711 (Acker, J. H.), 8vo. A French trans. of the "De Providentia," by Cappel [Auge], 1578, 8vo.

1479. **Ægidius de Roma.** De Peccato originali. 4to. *Oxonii.*
See Hain, 122. This Ed. not in the Brit. Mus. The above treatise will be found in the Author's Opera, *Romæ*, 1555, where may be seen his work "De Prædestinatione, Præscientia," &c. The work is very rare. An Exposition of Ægidius appeared in the "De generatione et corruptione" of Mars. Ficinus, *Paduæ*, 1493, fol.; *Venet.*, 1498, fol. The Author was a Roman Monk of the Augustine Order, so distinguished among his countrymen as to obtain the appellation of the Profound Doctor. He taught Philosophy and Theology at Paris, and was preferred by Boniface VIII. to the Episcopal see at Berri. He died 1316. In a general council at Florence his doctrine was enjoined to be inviolably observed by all students and readers of the Augustine Order. Ægidius was also author of "Aurea verba de gratia Dei, virtutibus et vitiis." *Mogunt.* [1467[, see Hain, 105.

1480. **Antonius** (Betlini) De divina præordinatione vitæ et mortis humanæ 4to. [*Florentiæ*].
Very rare, see Hain, 1278.

[1480]. **Pamphilo Lasso.** Capitolo de prædestinatione. 4to. *Brixiæ.*
Printed by Bern. de Misintis, see Hain, 12,296.

1481. **Maroldus** (Marcus) Sententia veritatis humanæ redemptionis. 4to. [*Romæ.*]
Printed by Each. Seller. Another Ed. [*Romæ*], 1481, 4to, printed by Steph. Plannck.

1483. **Terasse** (Petrus) Oratio de divina providentia. 4to. [*Romæ.*]
Printed by Steph. Plannck. The 1st Ed. was in 4to, without name of place or date, see Hain, 15,368, 15,369. Both Eds. are excessively rare. Never met with a copy. The Author was a Carmelite monk.

1485. **Haly** (Albonazen). Liber de Fatis Astrorum. fol. *Venet.*
See Hain, 8,349.

1487. **Chrysostom** (S.) Libri 3, de Providentia Dei, ad Stagyrium Monachum. 4to. *Alosten.*
Other Ed. [*Romæ*, about 1490], see Hain, 5,053, 5054; *Lond.*, 1545, 1547, 8vo, by Sir John Cheke, a native of Cambridge, and 1st Prof. of Greek in that University. Cheke in 1544 was chosen as one of the Latin tutors to Prince Charles; see Allibone i., 376, also see 1,526.

1488 **Caraccliolus** (Robt.) De numero damnatorum propter eorum peccata. 4to. *Venet.*
Other Ed., *Venet.*, 1489, 8vo; 1490, 4to; *s. l.*, 1490, 8vo; *Offenburg*, 1496, 8vo. Rare, no copy in Brit. Mus. See Hain, 4,439—4,443; see post 1,497.

1491. **Anselm** (Archbp. of Canterbury) Opera et Tract. fol. *Nuremberge.*
The works referred to are—Dialogus de casa Diaboli; De Voluntate; De libero Arbitrio dialogus; De Concordia Præscientiæ et Prædestinationis nec non Gratiæ Dei cum libero arbitrio; De redemptione generis humani. This, the 1st Ed., is very rare and valuable. Other Ed., *Argent.*, 1494; *Paris*, 1544, 1549, fol.; 1639, 8vo; 1675, 1721, fol.; *Venet.*, 1549, 1568; *Colon.*, 1560, 1573, fol.; *Colon. Agrip.*, 1612, 3 vols. fol.; *Lugd.*, 1630, 3 vols. fol. The best Ed. is *Venet.*, 1744, 2 vols. fol. The dialogue "De libero arbitrio" was published in the 3rd vol. of the "Opuscula," *Lovanii*, 1648, 4to. "De redemptione generis humani" was published separately, 1614, 8vo; 1631, 24mo; *Colon. Agrip.*, 1649, 12mo; and in *English*, 1704, 8vo. The "De Concordia" is perhaps the Author's greatest work. It was his last, and in it he undertakes to prove first, that prescience is not repugnant to freewill; secondly, that predestination does not exclude freewill; and thirdly, that grace does not exclude it. Anselm was canonized in the reign of Hen. VII., no doubt mainly on account of the stand he made against the English sovereign's claim in the matter of bishops. He was one of the principal revivers of literature after three centuries of profound ignorance, and has been called a second Augustine. He may be looked upon as the founder of Scholastic Metaphysics, inasmuch as he affords the first proper example of it, though other systems subsequently superseded his own, and some of his ideas were never followed up.

[1496]. **Fornerius** (Anton.) De Peccato Originali. 8vo. *Paris.*
Rare and singular; not in the Brit. Mus. Another Ed., *Paris*, 1498, 12mo. See Hain, 7,802-3.

——— **Applanus** (Const.) De humani arbitrii libertate et potestate. 4to. *Cremonæ.*
See Hain, 1,313.

1497. **Caracciolus** (Robt.) De Numero Prædestinatorum et Damnatorum. fol. *Argent.*
Very rare, not in the Brit. Mus. and not mentioned by Hain. The Author died 1493; see *ante*, 1488.

——— De resurrectione hominis a peccato et preparatione ad gratiam tractatus. 8vo.
Attributed to S. Bonaventura.

[1497]. Modus redemptionis humani lapsus. 4to. *S.L.*
See Hain, 11,506.

1500. **Hentisherus** (Guil.) Tract. de sensu composito et diviso. 4to. *Venet.*

——— **Landucius** (Bern.) Tract. de sensu composito et diviso. 4to. *Venet.*

——— **Pergulensis** (Paulus) Expositio de sensu composito et diviso. 4to. *Venet.*
See Hain, 12,629.

——— **Senis** (Bern. Petrus de) De sensu composito et diviso. 4to. *Venet.*
See Hain, 14,679.

1507. **Albertus** (M.) Summa, seu de mirabili scientia Dei. fol. *Argent.*

1509. **Picus** (John Fran.) De Providentia Dei contra Philosophastros. fol. *Argent.*

In "Opera," *Bononiæ*, 1496, fol.; *Basil*, 1601, 2 vols. fol. Another Ed., of above, *Got.*, 1615, 8vo. No Ed. in Brit. Mus. The Author was Prince of Mirandula and Concordia, and was assassinated by his nephew, Galesti Picus, 1533. He opposed at once the Heathen and the Scholastic systems.

1510. **Avitus** (Alcimus Ecdicius) libri sex. De Originali peccato, &c. 8vo. [*Paris.*]

This is in verse. The Author was Archbp. of Vienne. Another Ed., *Basil.* 1545, 8vo.

1513. **Natalis** (Hero.) Opuscula. fol. *Venet.*

De Voluntate—Quæstiones de peccato originali, &c. The Author died 1323.

1514. **Eckius** (Joh.) De Prædestinatione. fol. *Aug. Vind.*

The Author was a celebrated opponent of Luther in the Reformation.

——— [**Whitford** (Richard)] The Truyte of Redempcyon. 4to. *Lond.*

Other Ed. 1517, 1531, 16mo; 1532, 4to. The Author was educated at Oxford, and belonged to the order of St. Bridget, in the Monastery called Sion, near Brentford, Middlesex. He lived as Chaplain with Will. Mountjoy. There is no edition in the Brit. Mus. of the above work, under the Author's name, though most probably the Library does contain a copy.

1514. **Cusanus** (Nicolaus) Opera. *Paris.*

De Fortuna. Other Ed. *Bas.*, 1565, 3 vols, fol. The author d.1464, aged 63. For account of him see Wharton's app. to Cave Ed. 1693, p. 88. He was a man of rare sagacity, and an able mathematician. He was the first to bid adieu to the Scholastic creed. He was created a Cardinal. See c. Hatzhain vita Nic. de Cusa, *Trevor.* 1730, 8vo.

1515. **Fiera** (J. Bapt.) Tract. de loco Angeli, de Primo cognito, de Justitia pingenda, de Prædestinatione et de intentione ac Remissione. *Mant.*

——— **Hangestus** (Hier.) De Libero Arbitrio contra Lutherum. 4to. *Paris.*

Another Ed., *Paris*, 1524, 4to.

——— **Fulgentius** (Ruspensis) Opera. *Mogunt.*

Contains—Epistola synodica episcoporum Africanorum in Sardinia exulum, de gratia Dei et humano arbitrio—De veritate prædestinationis et gratiæ Dei, libri tres [separately *Paris*, 1612, 8vo] —De prædestinatione et gratia, liber unus—Censuræ inofficis censura, qua liber de prædestinatione et gratia; Fulgentio asseritur, et nitens purusque præstatur, à P. Theophilo Raynando, S.J.

Many Ed., *Hagen*, 1520, fol; *Colon. Agrip.*, 1526, 8vo, and 1668, 12mo; *Basil*, 1566, 8vo, pp., 850, rare Ed.; 1587 and 1621, 8vo; *Antv.*, 1570, 1574, 8vo; *Par.*, 1612, 1623 (Sirmondi) 1684 and 1688, 4to; *Venet.*, 1696, 8vo. The 3rd Treatise above was sep. pub. *Par.*, 1612, sm. 8vo. "Excerpta librorum contra Fabianum," first Ed. by Sirmondi, *Paris*, 1643, 8vo. The author was Bishop of Ruspa in 507, d. 533. He has been called the Augustine of his age. He certainly followed the Bishop of Hippo's doctrine, and imitated his style, so there may be some ground for the cognomen.

1518. **Basadonna** (Joannes) Dialogi quinque. 4to. *Venet.*

The 4th is "De admirabili Dei providentia;" the 5th "De divina electorum prædestinatione."

1519. **Lucius** (Lud.) Vindicæ Doctrinæ Prædestinationis. *Bas.*

——— **Clichtoveus** (Jod.) De Necessitate peccati Adæ et felicitate culpæ ejusdem. 4to. *Paris.*

Not in Brit. Mus. On same subject G. Beda (Natalis) [*Paris*], 1520, 4to.

1520. **Seyssel** (Claude de, Archiesp. Taurinensis) Tract. de Divina Providentia. 4to. *Paris.*

Not in the Brit. Mus. The author maintains that at the consummation of all things, the "new earth," will be the abode of unbaptized infants, and the virtuous heathen.

——— **Budæus** (Gul.) De Contemptu rerum fortuitorum lib. iii. 4to. *Paris.*

This edition which is in the Bodleian, does not seem to have been known to Arpe. Other Ed. *Lutet.*, 1521, 8vo; [*Paris*, 1525?], 4to; *Lugd. Bat.*, 1624, 8vo. Also in Opera, *Bas.*, 1557, 4 vols, fol.

[1520]. **Wesselus** (J.) Farrago Wesseli M. Wesseli...raræ et reconditæ Doctrinæ, notulæ...et propositiones...in hoc libello tractantur...1 De...dei providentia, &c. 4to. [*Cologne*].

The copy in the Brit. Mus. is imperfect. Other Ed., *Witteb.* [1522], 4to; *Basil.*, 1522, 4to; Another Ed. cura M. Lutheri, *Bas.*, 1525, 4to; others *Groningæ*, 1614; *Marpurgi*, 1617, see Wharton's app. to Cave Ed., 1693, p. 104. The author d. 1489; Opera, *Gron.*, 1614, 4to.

——— **Huttenus** (Huld.) Dialogi de Fortuna, &c. 4to. *Mogunt.*

Another Ed., *Lovanii*, 1521, 4to. The above is a rare volume.

1521. **Tertullian**.—Opera. fol. *Bas.*

Contains:—Lib. de Fato. Other Ed., 1579, fol.; *Heild*, 1596, fol.; *Franc.*, 1597, fol.; *Par.*, 1634, 1641, 1664, fol.; *Halæ*, 1770, 1776, 4 vols, 8vo.

——— **Melancthon** (Philip) Loci Communes rerum Theologicarum, seu Hypotyposes Theologicæ. sm. 8vo. *Witteb.*

"Editio originalis rarissima."—*Bauer.* "Der diese Ausgabe fur ganzlich verlorem gehalten hat."—*Baumgarten, Nachrichten.* This edition is particularly interesting, from the manner in which the author speaks of Freewill, see *ante p.* 49. The Loci passed through 67 Editions between 1521 and 1595, without including translations.

1524. **Erasmus** (Des.) De Servo Arbitrio Diatriba sive Collatio. pp. 93. sm. 8vo, *Basil. apud Frobenium.*

This work was the occasion of the great controversy with Luther, see p. 48. The first Ed. is very rare and valuable.

——— **Peristorius** (Hieron.) Bekänntniis auff des fürgelegten Extract eines Raths der Stadt Regensb., von dem Streit der Erbsunde. 4to.

——— **Aurelius** (Episc.) Epistola contra Pelagianos. 4to. *Mogunt.*

——— **Augustine** (Aur.) De Natura et Gratia. Item De Spiritu et Litera, unpaged [pp. 184] 12mo. *Noremb.*

1st Ed. very rare. The latter separately, *Witteb.*, 1545.

1524. **Ruperti Tunensis.**—De Voluntate et omnipotentia Dei. unpaged [pp. 77]. sm. 4to. *Noremb.*

In Opera, *Paris*, 1638, 2 vols. fol., vol. 2. p. 894; and *Venet.*, 1748, 4 vols. fol. The original Ed. above is very rare. The author was a Benedictine Abbot of the Monastery at Duyts on the Rhine, d. 1135.

——— **Cochlæus** (Jo.) De libero arbitrio hominis.

The author was Canon of Breslau—a zealous Roman engaged in fiery disputations with Luther, Osiander, Bucer, Melancthon, Calvin, and other leaders of the Reformation, d. 1552, aged 72. His best work is his "Historia Hussitarum."

——— **Prosper** (St.) Libellus adversus inimicos gratiæ Dei et Aurelii Carthaginiensis Episcopi, Epistola contra Pelagianos; Cælestini Papæ, et aliorum Romanorum Pontificum authoritas de gratiæ Dei pro Prospero et Hilario adversus Pelagianos; ex editione Nicolai Carbacchii. 4to. *Mogunt.*

Prospero was a disciple of Augustine, whose memory he defended. He opposed the Pelagians with great force, and d. about 463. Ed. of his works are *Lugd.*, 1539, fol.; *Duaci*, 1577; *Paris*, 1711, fol.; *Venet*, 1744, 2 vols, fol.; and *Bassani*, 1732, 2 vols, 4to.

1525. **Luther** (Mart.) De Servo Arbitrio. 8vo. *Wittemb.*

Other Ed., *Neostadii Palad.*, 1591, 8vo; *Neust.*, 1603, 8vo; *Francof.*, 1619, 4to; *Amst.*, 1611, 4to. A good Ed. by Sebast. Schmidio cum præf. apologetica Joh. Joach. Zeutgravii contra Pet. Yvonem, 1664, 8vo; *Argent.*, 1707. In Germ. by Just. Jonas, 1526, 4to. In Engl. by Henry Cole, *Lond.*, 1823, 8vo; by Ed. Thos. Vaughan, 1823, 8vo. The treatise was pronounced by Toplady to be a masterpiece of polemical composition.

——— **Dobneek** (Johann.) *Cochlæus* De libero arbitrio hominis adversus locos communes P. Melancthonis. 8vo. [*Stuttgard*].

——— **Pomponatius** (Pet.) Opera. fol. *Bas., et Venet.*

Contains:—De Fato—Libero Arbitrio Prædestinatione, Providentia Dei. Other Ed. 1556, 1567, fol. The author was one of the most renowned Peripatetics of Italy. Many superior men were formed in his school, such as Simon Porta or Portius, d. 1555; Paulus Jovius, d. 1552; Julius Cæsar Scaliger, d. 1559; Gaspar Contarini, and Augustus Niphus, d. 1546; and also the paradoxical freethinker Lucilio Vanini, burnt at Toulouse, in 1619.

1526. **Erasmus** (Des.) Hyperaspistes Diatribæ adv. servum Arbitrium Martini Lutheri. pp. 229. sm. 8vo. *Basil.*

This Ed. is very rare and valuable, see Walch I. 180, 181. Other Ed., *Antv.*, 1526, 8vo: *Basil.*, 1527, 8vo. The Treatise will be found in the ninth vol. of collected works, *Lug. Bat*, 1703, fol. It was translated into German by Emser, under the title "Schirm und Schutzbuchlein der diatriba wider Martini Luthers knechtlichen willen durch Erasmum von Roterdam, *Lips.*, 4to.

——— **Zuinglius** (Huld.) Declaratio de Peccato originali ad Urbanum Rhegium. 8vo. *Tiguri*

1526. **Minutius Felix.**—Opera. *Heidelb.*

Contains "De Fato." Other Ed., *Romæ*, 1543, fol; *Lugd. Bat.*, 1542, 4to, and 1672, 8vo: *Cantab.*, 1707, 8vo; *Lugd. Bat.*, 1709, 8vo; *Cantab.*, 1712, 8vo; *Glasg.*, 1750, 8vo.

——— **Sepulveda** (Joan. Genesius) De Fato et Libero arbitrio lib. iii. 4to. *Romæ.*

The Author was a Spanish writer, born at Cordova, 1491. He became chaplain and historiographer to the Emperor Charles V. He died at Salamanca, 1572.

——— **Chrysostom** (Jo.) De Fato, Ed. Erasmi. 8vo. *Basiliæ.*

About 1328 Triveltius wrote a work bearing the same title which is still in MS. in the Bodleian, see Arpe, *Theat. Fati* 43.

1527. **Sasgerus** (or Schatzgerus) (Gasp.) De Gratia et Libero Arbitrio. 8vo. *Tub.*

Ariba wrote a work under the same title without date, *Paris*, 4to; see Lipenius Bibl. Real. Theol. I., 743. Sasgerus was also Author of "Scrutinium div. Scripturæ pro conciliatione dogmatum de Gratia et libero Arbitrio, Fide et operibus," &c. *Coloniæ*, 4to.

——— **Augustine** (S.) De natura et gratia, liber unus (with Pref. by J. Petreius). 8vo. *Coloniæ.*

Rare. Another Ed., *Paris*, 1542, 16mo.

1528. **Wimpina** (Conr. C.) De Prædestinatione. *Franc. ad Oderam.*

The Author was Prof. of Divinity at Frankfort, and engaged in defence of the Papal power against Luther. He d. 1531.

——— ——— De Fato de Providentia Divina, et de bona Fortuna. fol. *Francof.*

——— **Augustine** (S.) Opera omnia ex emendatione Des. Erasmi. 10 vols. fol. *Bas.*

Other Ed., *Venet.*, 1529, 11 vols. fol.; 1584, 9 vols. 4to; *Paris*, 1531—32, 10 vols. fol.; 1541, 11 vols. fol.; 1586, 7 vols. fol.; 1613, 1614, 6 vols. fol.; Sup., 1654, fol.; *Bas*, 1543, 10 vols. fol., 1556, 10 vols, fol.; *Antv.*, 1587, 11 vols. fol.; *Lugd*, 1586, 10. vols fol.; 1661-3, 19 vols. 8vo; 1664, 11 vols. fol.; *Colon*, 1616, 11 vols. fol.; *Plant.*, 1676, 5 vols. fol. Best Ed., *Paris* and *Antv.*, 1679—1703, 11 vols. fol. Of this Ed. vols. 3, 4, 5, and 10, are each in two parts; the two parts which form vol. 3, have each a separate pagination. Every volume except vol. 4 has an appendix, separately paged, containing the supposititious works and illustrative extracts from various authors, &c, Vol. 1 to 10 have the *Paris* imprint; vol 12 (appendix Augustiana) was printed at *Amsterdam*, but with the imprint of *Antwerp*, and published separately. The vol containing the Vita Augustini and indices (*Paris*, 1700), is sometimes considered as the 11th of this Edition. Other Ed, *Venet.*, 1756, 10 vols. 4to; *Bassani*, 1797—1807, 18 vols, fol.; *Vercellis*, 1805, 3 vols. 4to, all pub.; *Venet.*, 1833—[1866], 11 vols. fol.; *Paris*, 1836—39, 11 vols. 8vo, a reprint of the Benedictine Ed.; (Caillan) 1836, 43 vols. 8vo; (*Migne*), vols 32—47, 1844, 4to. In English, *Edinb.*, 1871, 24 vols, 8vo. In French, *Paris* (*Vives*), 1872, 34 vols. 4to. The particular works relating to Grace, Predestination, and Freewill, were first separately pub. in 1538, which see, also, 1677, La Bigne (M. de) vol. 14, fol.; also in the Opuscula Selecta, *Brux.*, 1658, pp. 514, 12mo, which is a very good edition. "De libero arbitrio" first appeared with others, *Venet.*,

1491, 4to; again, *Parmæ*, 1491, fol. "Excerpta ex Augustino de libertate arbitrii," *Paris*, 1639. The two books on Grace and Original Sin, separately, 1791, 4to; [Cigheri (A. M.) vol. 7], 1874, 16mo; [Hurter (H. von) vols. 36 and 37]; translated into French, *Paris*, 1738, 12mo; and by *Arnault*, *Paris*, 1644 and 1647, 8vo. One book also by C. J. de Troyes, *Paris*, 1685, 12mo. "Adversus Julianum," and "Liber de gestis Pelagii," *Paris*, 1616. The two works on Predestination and Perseverance published separately, 1744, fol.; 1782, fol.; and with Letters 105, 106, and 107, translated into French by J. Legni, *Paris*, 1676, 12mo; 1715, 12mo. On grace, freewill, and predestination, translated into French (by C. Lequeux], *Paris*, 1757, 12mo The Predestination and Perseverance translated into English by N. Lesse, *Lond.*, 1550, 8vo; and by John Scory, Bp. of Chichester, *Lond.* [1556?], 8vo. The Anti-Pelagian Works, Ed. by Will Bright, *Oxford [printed in London]*, 1880, 8vo. by F. H. Woods, and J. D. Johnston, *London*, 1887, 8vo.

1528 **Cassiani** (Constantinopolitani Diaconi) Collatio de Libero Arbitrio. 4to. *Haganoæ.*

Rare. In works, *Bas.*, 1575.

1529. **Bovillus** (Carolus) De Voto, libero Arbitrio, et differentia Orationis. 8vo. *Paris.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Cabranes** (Didac. de) Clave Espiritual para abrir la alta Materia de la Prædestinacion. 4to. *Toleti.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Bonicontrus** (Laur.) Tract. Electionum. *Norib.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

1530. **Salvianus** (Massilien. Episc.) Libri VIII. de vero Judicio et providentia Dei et ipsius gubernatione hominum et rerum mundi hujus, ex editione Joan. Alex. Brassicani. fol. *Bas.*

Other Ed., *Romæ*, 1564, fol.; *Paris*, 1570, 8vo; and 1575, 12mo; 1580, 8vo; 1607, 8vo; 1617, 12mo; and 1701, 8vo; *Althorpii*, 1611, 8vo; *Oxonii*, 1633, 12mo; *Paris* (*Migne*), 1865, 8vo; translated into French, *Lyons*, 1575, 8vo; *Paris*, 1655, 4to; 1700, 2 vols. 12mo; 1701 and 1734, 12mo. Also in works, *Bremæ*, 1688, 4to; *Venet.*, 1696 and 1728, 8vo; *Redeponti*, 1743, 4to. The Author flourished about 440, and was well skilled in the sciences. He was called the Jeremiah of the fifth century, on account of his distress at the wickedness of the age.

1531. **Cornellius** (Aust.) Exactissima Infantium in Limbo clausorum Querela, adversus divinum Judicium; apud æquum Judicem proposita. Apologia divini Judicii contra Querelam Infantium. 4to. *Paris.*

Rare, no copy in the British Museum, see Bayle art. Cornellius and Wechel. De Bure Bibl. Instructive, i. 272-274 and Clement Bibl. curieuse, vii. 302, 309. "Cet ouvrage singulier renferme diverses propositions hasardées qui le firent supprimer si rigoureusement, que les exemplaires en sont devenus extraordinairement rares. Il fut, si non la cause, du moins l'epoque de la ruine du fameux imprimeur Wéchel-Fourier.

——— **Briton** (Hen. Jacob) Tract. de libero hominis arbitrio, adversus nonnullos modernos qui illud tollere nituntur. 4to. *Romæ.*

Not in the British Museum.

1532. **Petrus** (Christiern) De Gratia Divina et confessione, lib. 1. *Malmog.*

The author was a learned Danish divine, who maintained the principles of the Reformation. In 1529 he published the New Testament in Danish.

——— **Marius** (August.) Homilia de prædestinatione divina. 4to. *Herbepoli.*

1533. **Chrysostom** (St. J.) Conciones sex de Providentia Divina. Lat. per Ch. Hegendorphium. 8vo. *Hagen.*

——— **Bodius** (Herm.) De lapsu adæ. *Colon.*

1534. **Bucer** (Mart.) Defensio contra Criminationem Roberti Episc. Abrincensis de Eucharistia, Gratia, Libero Arbitrio, &c. 12mo. *Argent.*

Bucer was one of the leading Reformers. He adopted most of Luther's sentiments, but in 1532 gave the preference to those of Zuinglius. He has been accused of holding opinions afterwards known as Arminian, but his views though moderate were distinctly Calvinistic, at least on the five points. He died in 1551 at Cambridge, in which University he had taught theology for some years.

——— **Driedo** (Joannes) De captivitate et redemptione humani generis, liber unus. 4to. *Lovanii.*

Another Ed. same place, 1548, fol. Also in Opera, *Lovan*, 1550, 1572-76, 4 vols. fol.

——— **Orianus** (Lodov.) De potestate Summi Pontificis, de fide et operibus, de libero arbitrio, ad Lutherum responsio. 8vo. *Venet.*

——— **Amandus** (Joh. de S.) De Usu Idoneo Auxiliorum. *Mogunt.*

1535. **Dionysius Carthus.** Commentar. in IV. libros Sententiarum. 4 vols. fol. *Colon.*

De hominis redemptione, &c., also *Venet.*, 1584, fol.

[1535 or 1531.] **Agrippa** (Hen. Corn.) Opera. 3 vols. 8vo. *Lugd.*

Vol. 2, p. 551 is "De originali peccato."—The work is very rare. "La contrefaction de cet ouvrage est exécutée en lettres rondes.—*Fournier*; another Ed., *Lugd*, 1600, 2 vols., 8vo. The Author's great learning procured him the reputation of a Magician, and his treatise De Occulta Philosophia (*Colon*, 1527 2 vols. 8vo.; *Paris*, 1529; *Mechliniæ*, 1533, fol.; *Antv.*, 1530, 4to; *La Haye*, 1727, 2 vols. 8vo.) established this reputation. He died at Grenoble 1535, aged 49.

——— **Schotenius** (Herm.) Colloquia de Modo petendæ utriusque Fortunæ. 8vo. *Colon.*

About this year Reinerus Snoius a doctor of Medicine wrote a work entitled "De Fato et de Essentia, Potentiis et Passionibus Animæ," see Arpe *Theat. Fati.*, p. 58.

1536. **Calvin** (Joh.) Institutio Christianæ Religionis. *Genev.*

Numerous Editions, 3rd, *Argent*, 1543, fol.; 4th, *Argent*, 1545, fol.; 5th, *Genev.*, 1550, pp. 735, 8vo; 6th, *Geneve*, 1554, 8vo, and 1559, fol.; the latter being the last edition by the Author, and the standard of every subsequent one. Other Ed., *Heidelb*, 1572, fol.; *Genev*, 1585, 8vo, 1590, fol., 1592, fol. and 8vo, 1609, fol., 1612, 8vo, 1618, 8vo, 1637, 8vo; *Lug.*, 1583, 12mo, 1584, 8vo,

Lug. Bat., 1654, fol.; *Amst.* 1667, fol.; *Lovan*, 1676; 8vo; *Berol.*, 1834, 2 vols. 8vo; 1846, 2 vols. 8vo. In Dutch, *Amst.*, 1650, fol. In French with pref. by Calvin, *Genev.*, 1560, fol., 1562, fol., 1565, 8vo, 1566 fol., 1818, 3 vols 8vo; *Breme*, 1713, fol.; *Paris*, 1859, 2 vols. 8vo. In Italian, *Genev*, 1557, 4to, very rare, being first translation. In Spanish, 1597, 4to. Printed in *Lond. by Rich. Field*, rare as copies were taken and destroyed by the Inquisition; 1847, 16mo, and 8vo. In German, *Heideb.*, 1572, fol.; 1608, 4to; *Elberfeld*, 1823, 8vo. In Hungarian, *Hanand Francof.*, 1624, 4to; *Græce*, 1618; *Lug. Bat.*, 1654, fol. In English, 1st Ed., *Lond.*, *by Wolfe & R. Harrison*, 1561, fol.; *Lond.*, 1562, fol., 1574, 4to, 1578, 8vo; by *Thomas Norton*, *Lond.*, 1578, 1587, 4to, 1599, 4to, 1634, fol., 1641, fol.; *by Allen*, *Lond.*, 1813, 3 vols. 8vo; 1838, 2 vols. 8vo; 1844, 2 vols. 8vo; *by Beveredge*, *Edinb.*, 1845, 3 vols., 1863, 2 vols. 8vo; Abridgment in Eng., by Edm. Bunny, 1500, 8vo; by Chas. Fetherstone, *Edinb.*, 1585, pp. 398, 8vo; 1587, 8vo; *Lond.*, 1837, 12mo, 1853, 16mo; Analysis. Dan. Colonii, *Leydæ*, 1636, 12mo.

1536. **Alexander,** *Aphrodisæus,* De Fato. fol. *Venet.*

Another Editon, *Venet.*, 1541, fol.; 1549, 1555, fol.

1537. **Driedo** (Joh.) De Gratia et Libero Arbitrio lib. ii. De concordia liberi Arbitrii et Prædestinationis Divinæ. pp. 272, 105. 4to. *Lovanii.*

This 1st Ed. only in Brit. Mus.

Another Ed. same place, 1547, fol. Driedo was also the Author of a treatise "De libertate Christiana," *Lovan.* 1548, fol. He was an opponent of Luther, but his zeal was moderate. He died at Louvain, 1535.

See 1534.

1538. **Prosper** (St.) Opuscula de gratia et libero arbitrio, accedunt ejusdem epigrammata super quasdam D. Augustini sententias exarata. sm. 8vo. pp. 48. *Venet.*

A rare and valuable work, containing the letter on Freewill to Rufinus, the book against Cassian, the letter against Pelagius, etc. Prosper's Collected Works, *Lugd.*, 1539, fol.; *Colon*, 1540, 8vo; *Lovan*, 1566, 4to; *Duaci*, 1577, 8vo; *Colon Agrip.*, 1630, 8vo; *Paris*, 1711, fol.; *Romæ*, 1732, 8vo, 1754, 12mo; *Bassani*, 1782, 2 vols. fol. See for contents of works 1711 Ed., and also for separate works on grace and freewill, 1524.

——— **Romæus** (Fran. à Castellione) De libertate operum et necessitate, adversus Pseudophilosophos Christianos. *Lugd.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Augustine** (Aur.) De Gratia et libero arbitrio: de correptione et gratia liber unus, epistolæ contra eos qui negant liberum arbitrium. sm. 8vo. *Venet.*

Also with others, *Romæ*, 1754 and 1778, 7 vols. 12mo.

——— **Augustine** (Aur.) Contra Pelagianos et Celestianos hyponosticon libri vi. 12mo. *Venet.*

——— ——— De prædestinatione et gratia, liber unus. 12mo. *Venet.*

——— **Wicelius** (Geo.) Homilæ ... ... de libero arbitrio, &c. 4to. *Lips.*

Another Ed., *Colon*, 1548, 8vo.

This last, but not the Ed. of 1638, in the Brit. Mus.

Also another of "Subsidium de voluntate christiani hominis, *Lipsiæ*, 1534, 4to.

1538. **Pontanus** (Joannes Jovianus) Opera. 3 vols. 8vo. *Bas.*

Contains, De Fortuna, libri iii. Other editions, *Vent*, 3 vols, 1548, 4to; *Bas.*, 1556, 4 vols. 8vo.

See Arpe 54. The Author was an Italian, died 1503, aged 78.

[1540.] **Redman** (Rob.) Devoute Prayers in Englysche of the Acts of our Redemption.

1540. **Ziegler** (Jac.) In Genesim mundi et exodum commentarii ejusdem—super arbitrio humano, &c. fol. *Bas.*

Another Ed., same place, 1548. Lipenius Bib. Real. Theo. ii. 184.

No Ed. in Brit. Mus.

——— **Valla** (Laur.) Opera. fol. *Bas.*

This contains De libero arbitrio et Providentia Divina. The Author was a Doctor of Theology, who flourished 1440, d. 1465, aged 50. See Wharton's app. to Cave, ed. 1693, pp. 82, 83.

Other Ed., *Basileæ*, 1543, fol. The De Libero Arbitrio separately; *Argent*, by Georg. Husner, no date, fol. see *Hain*, 15,830, S.L., 1482, fol.

1541. **Alardus** (Franc.) Dissert. tres breves .....de peccato originali ex Adam. 8vo. *Antv.*

Not in Brit. Mus.

——— **Catharinus** (Ambrose) Opuscula, &c. 8vo. *Lugd.*

Contains "Summa doctrinæ de Prædestinatione," and "De Peccato originali, et Dialogus de Justificatione." Both published *Romæ*, 1550, 4to, and the latter again *Romæ*, 1555. Not in the Brit. Mus. The Author was an eminent polemical divine. His real name was Lancelot Politi, which he changed on becoming a Dominican. He was at the Council of Trent, and in 1547 was made Bishop of Minori in the Kingdom of Naples, whence he was translated to the Archbishopric of Conza in 1551. He died 1553.

1542. **Catharinus** (Ambrose) De Statu futuro puerorum sine sacramento decedentium. *Lugd.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Pighius** (Alb.) De libero hominis arbitrio et Divina Gratia. fol. *Colon.*

The Author was a Roman divine, and wrote against Luther, Calvin and others. He died at Utrecht 1542. It is not generally known that this work will be found amongst those prohibited by the Spanish Inquisition. It evidently was too much tainted with Pelagianism to pass muster, notwithstanding its other recommendations in their eyes.

——— **Silvagius** (Matth.) Opus. pp. xxiv and 256.

Contains De gratia, de electione Dei et hominum et prædestinat. sanctorum.

1543. Nessary Doctrine and Erudition for an Christen Man, sette furthe by the Kynges Magestie of Englande. 4to. *Lond. Tho. Berthelet.*

——— **Calvin** (Jo.) Defensio sanæ et orthodoxæ doctrinæ de servitate et liberatione humani arbitrii. 4to. *Genev.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

1543. **Curio** (Cœl. Sec.) Araneus, seu de Providentia Dei Libellus; vere aureus, cum aliis ejusdem opusculis. 8vo. *Bas.*

"Fort rare."—*Clement*, Other Ed., same place, 1544, 1554, 8vo. The Ed. of 1543 not in the Brit. Mus. That of 1544 is.

1544. **Muscullus** (Wolfg.) Comment. in Evang. Matt. et in singulis locis Marci, et Lucæ. 3 vols. fol. *Bas.*

In cap. 12, Matt. (*original sin*).

——— **Pistorius** (J.) Dialogus de fato et fortuna etc. 4to.

1545. **Theodoret.** De Providentia Orat. sm. 8vo. *Romæ et Tiguri.*

Other Ed., *Lips.*, 1564, and 1566, 2 tom; *Par.*, 1568, (by Bienne) and 1569, 8vo; 1571, 2 vols, 8vo; *Tiguri*, 1646, 8vo. In French, *Par.*, 1555, 4to, and *Lyon.*, 1578, 8vo. In Italian, 1551, 8vo. Also in vol. 4 of Opera omnia *Halæ*, 1769-74, 5 vols. 8vo. The Author was Bishop of Cyrus, a city of Syria, and died 457—see 1602. His homilies "De Providentia," *Tiguri*, 1546, 8vo. *Paris*, 1630, 8vo.

[1545.] **Zuinglius** (Huldrich) Opera. 4 vols. fol. *Zurich.*

In vol. 1, Tract. Theol. De Providentia; in vol. 2, De peccato originali declaratio, ad Urbanum Rhegium. Another Edition, *Tiguri*, 1581, 3 vols, fol. The Author was the celebrated Swiss Reformer.

——— **Rivio** (Jo.) De admirando Dei consilio in celando mysterio redemptionis humanæ. *Bas.*

1546. **Vega** (Andr.) De Justificatione, Gratia, et Meritis. 4to. *Venet.*

——— **Schwenckfeldt** (C.) Von der Sünde vnd Gnad. Adam vnd Christ. 4to.

——— **Bunderius** (Joa.) Compendium concertationis hujus sæculi sapientum ac theologorum super erroribus moderni temporis. pp. 12, 272. *Paris.*

Contains. De origine peccato,—De Gratia et libero arbitrio. Other Ed., *Venet*, 1548, pp. 247; *Antv.*, 1555, pp. 16, 228, 8vo. Only this last Ed. in Brit. Mus.

[1547.] **Gilby** (Anthony) A Briefe Treatise of Election and Reprobation. 12mo. *Lond.*

A rare tract. The copy in the Brit. Mus. is mutilated. Another Ed. seems to have appeared at *Geneva*, 1576, 16mo.

——— **Soto** (Domin.) Denatura et gratia, libri tres. 4to. *Venet.*

Rare; other Ed., *Par.*, 1549; *Antwerp*, 1550, pp. iv. and 268, fol.; *Venet*, 1584, 4to; *Salmant*, 1588, 4to. The *Antwerp* Ed. only in the Brit. Mus. The above work deals with original sin. The Author was a learned Spanish Dominican, and one of the most active members of the Council of Trent, also Confessor to Charles V. He died 1560, aged 66. He wrote a commentary on the Romans, *Antv.*, 1550.

——— Apologia F. Dominici Soto; qua Ambrosio Catharino de certitudine gratiæ respondet. 8vo. *Venet.*

[1548.] **Lambert** (Franc.) The minde & judgement of maister F. Lambert of Avenna of the Wyll of Man, declaryne and proving how it is captyve and bonde and not free, taken out hys commentaries upon Osee the Prophete..... Newelye translated into Englishe by N[icholas] L[esse] &c. 8vo. *Lond.*

1549. **Cragius** (M. T.) De Imagine Dei in primis parentibus, ac destructione et Renovatione ejus, unpaged. 12mo. *Witteb.*

With Preface by Melancthon. Very rare, not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Cragius** (Tilemann) De imagine Dei et primorum hominum conditorum ad effigiem Dei. De corruptione...De renovatione Imaginis, etc. 8vo. *Magd.*

This is in the Brit, Mus.

[1550]. **Ochino da Siena** (Bern.) Prediche, nomate Laberinthi, overo del Servo Arbitrio, Prescienza, Predestinatione, et Liberta Divina. 8vo. *Basil. s. a.*

An Ed. of his Sermons, *Venet.*, 1541, 8vo, is extremely rare. And so is the above work, which was translated into Latin, and published at Basle, 8vo. S.A. A copy of this edition was in Dr. Williams' Library. The copy in the Sunderland Library is now in the Author's possession. A copy [1561], in Italian is mentioned in Stewart's catalogue 1877, p. 156, and also in the Catalogue of the Library of the Duc de la Valliere, Ed. 1783, vol. i., p. 293. Charles V. who used to attend his sermons when in Italy, pronounced this high encomium on him. "That man would make the stones weep." Sadolet and Bembo assign to him the palm of popular eloquence.

Ochinus proves in the above work that they who assert that man acts freely, entangle themselves in four very great difficulties; and that they who maintain that man acts necessarily, expose themselves to four other strong objections; which altogether make up eight Labyrinths, four against freewill, and four against necessity or fate. He turns himself every way imaginable, in order to find out an issue; and meeting with none, he concludes every article by a fervent prayer to God, to be delivered out of these mazes. However in the following part of his work he attempts to furnish us with some hints to extricate ourselves out of these perplexities; but he concludes upon the whole, that the only method is to say with Socrates, "Unum scio, quod nihil scio;" the only thing I know is that I know nothing. We ought to be silent, says he, and to judge that God does not require of us to take either the affirmative or the negative side of the question upon such difficult subjects.

Ochinus was an Italian, who embraced Luther's doctrine. He came to England with Peter Martyr, and they were both made Preb. of Canterbury in 1547. On the death of Edward VI. they both left England returning to Strasburg. Ochinus subsequently had charge of a church in Zurich, but before his death in 1564 joined the Socinians. Life by Benrath (Karl) translated by H. Zimmern, 1876, 8vo.

——— **Lambert** (Joh.) A Treatise of Predestination and Election. 8vo. *Camb.*

The author was burnt in Smithfield, Oct., 1538. See an interesting account of the Martyr in Middleton's Biog. Evan. i., 139.

1550. **Bacon** (Lady Ann) Translation from the Italian of 25 Sermons written by B. Ochine, on Predestination and Election. 8vo. *Lond.*

Lady Bacon was appointed governess to Edw. VI. She was a daughter of Sir Anthony Cooke, and wife of Sir Nicholas Bacon, Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal. She translated Bishop Jewel's celebrated "Apology," with fidelity and elegance.

[1550]. **Ochino** (Bern.) Fourtene Sermons concernyng the Predestinacion and Eleccion of God, transl. out of Italian by A[nne] C[ooke]. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Guarimbertus** (Girolamus) De Fortuna. 8vo. *Venet.*

——— **Augustine** (St.) A Worke of the predestination of saints wrytten by the famous doctor S. Augustine, and translated by N. Leese, Londiner. Item, another worke of the sayde Augustyne, entytuled, of the vertue of perseverance to thend, translated by the sayd N. L. B.L. 8vo. *Lond.*

Another trans. by J. Scory [*Lond.*, 1556?], 8vo. Both works are very rare and seldom to be met with.

——— **Cicero** (M. T.) De Fato liber P. Rami prælectionibus explicatus, &c. 4to. *Lutetiæ.*

Earlier Ed. of "De Fato," *S.L.*, 1485, fol.; *Venet.*, 1485, fol.; 1494, fol.; *S.L.* [*about* 1490], 4to; *S.L.*, 1499, fol.; *Bonon.*, 1499, fol.; see Hain, 5336, 5340—5344. Another Ed., *Lips.*, 1795, 8vo. In Works, *Mediolani*, 1498, fol.; (see Hain, 5056). *Basil.*, 1534, fol.; *Venet.*, 1537, fol.; *Paris*, 1539, 1555, fol.; 1740—42, 4to; 1768, 12mo; *Lugd.*, 1562, 8vo; 1596, 4to; 1642, 12mo; 1661, 4to; 1692, 12mo; *Lutetiæ*, 1566, fol.; *Hamb.*, 1618—19, fol.; *Lond.*, 1681, fol.; 1820, 12mo; *Amst.*, 1724, fol., 4to, and 8vo; *Glasg.*, 1749, 12mo; *Genev.*, 1758, 4to; *Halis Saxon.*, 1774—76, 8vo; *Biponti*, 1780—87, 8vo; *Oxon.*, 1783, 4to; *Mannhem.*, 1783—87, 8vo; *Lips.*, 1814—20, 8vo; 1850, 4to; 1860—69, 8vo; *Boston*, 1815—16, 12mo; *Halæ et Berolini*, 1820—24, 8vo; *Turici*, 1826—38, 8vo; 1845—62, 8vo.

——— Fünff Caluinische Articel, darmit ein Christ, der in dem Caluinischen Glauben absterben will, sich in seinem Todbeth trösten Soll., &c. [a Satire on the doctrine of predestination.]

——— **Calvin** (J.) De Prædestinatione et providentia Dei libellus. 8vo. *Genev.*

1551. **Infantas** (Ferd. de las) Tract. de Prædestinatione de libero arbitrio et de divinis auxiliis. 8vo. *Paris.*

Other Ed. same place, 1601 and 1653, 8vo.

——— **Catharinus** (Amb.) Expurgatio contra Apologiam Dom. Soto, et Confirmatio Defensionis, Catholicorum pro possibili certitudinis Gratiæ. 8vo. *Lugd.*

——— **Catharinus** (Amb.) Disceptationes de Certitudine inhærentis Gratiæ, de Prædestinatione, Peccato Originali, Potentia Liberi Arbitrii in statu Naturæ lapsæ, et de Desertione ac Induratione Dei. 4to. *Romæ.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

1551. **Turner** (Will.) A Preservatiue, or Triade against the poyson of Pelagius, lately renewed and stirred up again by the furious Sect of the Anabaptists. 16mo. *Lond.*

——— **Tisdale** (Joh.) A Treatise of Predestination. *Lond.*

——— **Portius** (Sim.) Disputatio, an Homo bonus vel malus volens fiat. 4to. *Florent.*

See Arpe's Theat. Fati. The work is not often to be met with.

[1551]. **Fontisiccus** (Hier.) De Prædestinatione tractatus. [*Neapoli*].

Very rare, not in the Brit. Mus. Have only met with one copy.

1552. **Disp.** de Cognitione Hominis, ubi de Peccato, Libero Arbitrio, &c.

——— **Mychell** (John) A Treatise on Predestination, &c. *Canter.*

——— **Calvin** (Jo.) De æterna Dei prædestinatione. 8vo. *Genev.*

An English Translation by Henry Cole, D.D., *Lond.*, 1856, 8vo. pp. 192, under the head "Calvin's Calvinism," part I. A French Ed. also appeared the same year in 12mo.

——— **Jarchus** (Sal.) Com. in Pentateuchum seu Legem. *Constantinæ.*

Gen. XII., 3.

——— **Honorius Augustodunensis**: De prædestinatione et libero arbitrio dialogus; item Prosperi et Hilari Arelat. epp. 2 ad Augustin, de reliquiis Pelag. hæreseos, etc. 12mo. *Colon.*

Another ed. of Honorius, *Colon, Agr.*, 1618, and by Jo. Conen, *Antv.*, 1624, 8vo.

The 1st Ed. was [*Norimb., printed by Ant. Koburger, about* 1490]. See Hain, 8801.

1553. **Hemmingius** (Nicol.) Tractatus de Gratia Universali. 8vo. *Francof.*

Other Ed. same place, 1563, 1591, 8vo; and 1616, 8vo; see too 1595.

This work is against the Anabaptists.

1553. **Luther** (M.) Disputatio de Operibus legis et gratiæ. 8vo.

1554. **Calvin** (J.) Brevis responsio ad diluendas nebulonis cujusdem calumnias, quibus doctrinam de æterna dei prædestinatione fœdare conatus est. *Ebend.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Bononia** (Joannes a) De æterna Dei Prædestinatione et Reprobatione sententia. fol. *Lovanii.*

Another Ed., *Lovanii*, 1555, 8vo.

——— **Bullinger** (H.) De gratia Dei Justificante. 4to. *Tiguri.*

Very rare. Not in the Brit. Mus.

1555. **Tunstall** (Cuth.) Opus Contra impios Blasphematores Dei Prædestinationis. 4to. *Antv.*

The Author was Vicar Gen. to the Archbishop of Canterbury (Warham), Rector of Harrow-on-the-Hill, 1511, Preb. of Lincoln, 1514, Archdeacon

of Chester, 1515, Master of the Rolls, 1516, Preb. of York, 1519, Preb. and Dean of Salisbury, 1521, Bishop of London, 1522, Lord Privy Seal, 1523, Bishop of Durham, 1530, died 1559. He was a moderate Roman Catholic.

1555. **Bersoe** (E.) Essai sur la Providence. 12mo. *Paris.*

——— [**Visdomini** (Franc.)] Misterio della S. Trinitate Del primato, della S. Rom. Chiesa, Della predestinatione. pp. 126. *Venet.*

Not under Visdomini in the Brit. Mus. Dedicated to "Luigi Lipomano, vescovo."

——— **Pfefinger** (John) De libero arbitrio.

1556. Calumniæ Nebulonis cujusdam Calvini de occulta Dei Providentia Joh. Calvini, ad eadem Responsio. 8vo. *Genev.*

Another Ed., same place, 1558. Translated into Engl. by H. Cole, *D.D.*, *Lond.*, 1857, 8vo, pp. 148, under the head "Calvin's Calvinism, 2nd Part, a Defence of the Secret Providence of God," &c.

——— **Camerarius** (Barth.) De Gratia et libero arbitrio, contra Calvinum. 4to. *Paris.*

——— **Beza** (Theod.) Brief declaration of the Chiefe Points of Christian Religion, set forth in a table of Predestination. 16mo. *Genev.*

The Author was the great minister of Geneva, and one of the pillars of the Reformation. He was a Supralapsarian, see p. 51, died 1605.

——— **Herold** (John) Hæreseologia. fol. *Bas.*

——— **Roberti** Traductio larvæ sycophanticæ, petulantissimæque impietatis Calvinicæ. 8vo. *Paris.*

——— **Vale** (Anth. de) Spieghel der Calvinisteu. 8vo. *Antv.*

In French, *Paris*, 1561.
Neither Ed. in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Redman** or **Redmayne** (John, *D.D.*) The Complaint of Grace. 8vo.

The Author was Public Orator of the Univ. of Oxf., first Master of Trinity Coll., Archdeacon of Taunton, Preb. of Wells and of Westminster.

"Redman was esteemed the most learned divine of that time."—*Bishop Burnet.*

1557. **Turrianus** (Franc.) Dogmaticus de Justificatione et Electione Divina. *Romæ.*

——— **Synesius** (Cyrenæus) Ægyptius, seu disputatio de providentia et Epistola ad Orum. 8vo. *Basil.*

The Author was Bishop of Ptolemais.

1558. **Verratus** (Joh. Mar.) De Gratia et Libero Arbitrio, de duplici Purgatorio, et de suffragiis annuisque Legalis defunctorum. 8vo. *Venet.*

"Lipenius Bibl. Real. Theol., i. 745," has this under date 1508, but this is an error, see vol. 2, 184.

——— **Stolsius** (J.) Refutatio Propositionum Pfeffingeri de Libero Arbitrio cum præfatione Jo. Aurifabri et M. Flacii Illyrici libello de eadem controversia. 4to

Not in the Brit. Mus.

1558. Demonstratio manifesti mendacii, quo Nicolaus ab Amsdorst infamare conatur Joan. Pfeffingerum, Pastorem ecclesiæ Lipsiensis. 4to. *Witteb.*

——— **Orosius** (Paul.) Liber apologeticus contra Pelagium de arbitrii libertate, nunc primum editus, item Hieronymi epistola adversus Pelagium, ad Ctesphontem; ex editione Joannis Costerii. 8vo. *Lovan.*

Other Ed., *Mogunt.*, 1615, 8vo; *Paris*, 1639; *Lugd. Bat.*, 1738, 4to. The Author was a Spanish historian and divine, and a disciple of St. Augustine, who sent him to consult St. Jerome on the origin of the soul. He flourished about 416. Best known for his Miseria Humana.

[1558.] **Traheron** (Barth.) Exposition of the 4th Chap. of the Revelations, which treateth of the providence of God. *Lond.*

A rare and scarce work.

——— Scholasticorum Wittebergensium Refutatio responsionis Flacii. 4to. *Witteb.*

Also about same date another work, "Tractatus Scholasticorum Wittebergensium Refutatio contra Flacium." 4to.

1560. **Flacii** et Strigelii Disputatio de Peccato Originali et libero arbitrio. 4to. *Jenæ.*

——— **Knox** (John) An Answer to a great number of blasphemous cavellations written by an Anabaptist and adversarie of God's eternal Predestination. 8vo. *Genev.*

Reprinted *Lond.*, 1591, 8vo. The Author was the celebrated Scotch Reformer.

——— **Arnesius** (Rob.) De Justitia Divina et Humana et utriusque origine ac progressu, virtute et laudibus, Justitiæ et Legum omnium Mundi liber. 4to. *Paris, apud Wechelium.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

[1560]. **Veron** (Jean) A Moste Necessary treatise of free will, not onlye against the Paptistes, but also against the Anabaptistes, made dialoge wyse by J. V. B. L. 8vo. *Lond.*

Very rare—usually found imperfect.

——— Reponse de Jean Calvin aux calomnies d'Albert Pighius, contenant la defense de la saine et sainte doctrine contre le franc arbitre des Papistes. 8vo.

Not apparently in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Flacius** (Matth.) Adversus adiaphoristicas Fraudes et errores. 8vo. *Magdeb.*

(Original Sin). He also wrote "Refutatio doctrinæ de originali Justitia."—*Basil*, 1570

1561. **Becher** (Richard) Twoo bookes of Saint Ambrose—entytuled of the vocation and callying of all nations. Newly translated out of Latin into Englysche by H. B. 8vo.
Very rare.

——— **Du Val** (A.) Les contrarietez et contredicts qui se trouvent en la doctrine de J. Calvin, *etc.*.....avec les demandes et repliques à J. Calvin, sur son livre de la Predestination. 8vo. *Paris.*
Very rare. The only copy I ever met with is in the Brit. Mus.

1562. **Modryewski** (A. F.) De peccato, de libero arbitrio, de providentia et prædestinatione Dei æterna. Ejusdem de mediatore, libri tres. accessit Narratio——et expostulatio cum Stanislao Orichovio Roxolano. 4to. *S.L.*
Very rare. The Author was secretary to the King Sigismund August. The work much embarrassed the Protestant cause.

——— **Bucer** (Mart.) Liber de Prædestinatione, Causa Peccati, Libero Arbitrio, Excæcatione Impiorum. 8vo.
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Wigandus** (Jo.) Tractatus de libero hominis arbitrio integro ; corrupto in rebus externis ; mortuo in rebus spiritualibus, et renato. 8vo. *Jenæ.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Bradford** (John) Godlie meditations on the Lordes Prayer.....with a Defence of God's Eternal Election and Predestination.
Another Ed., *Lond.*, 1622. 8vo.

——— ——— A Short and Pithie defence of the doctrine of the Holy Election and Predestination of God. 16mo. *Lond.*
The Author of the two works was the well known martyr under Q. Mary. He was a native of Lancashire. Fel. of Pembroke Hall, Camb., and a strong Calvinist.

——— **Flacius** (Mathias) [Illyricus] Disputatio cum Victorino Strigelio de Originali Peccato et Libero Arbitrio cum aliis ejusdem argumenti. 4to. *Brem. and Jenæ.*
Another Ed., *S.L.*, 1563, 4to, mentioned by Walch, *Bibl. Theol.*, iii.. 808. Flacius was one of the most learned of the Protestant Reformers, born 1520, d. at Frankfort, 1575. He was the principal writer among the Magdeburg centuriators.

——— **Heshusius** (Tilem.) De Servo hominis arbitrio, et conversione ejus per Dei gratiam, contra Synergiæ assertores. 4to. *Magdeb.*
Against Synergism. He was also Author of "Com. in Epist. ad Rom." 1605, which is not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Fricius** (And.) De Peccato Originis, de Libero Arbitrio, de Providentia et Prædestinatione Dei æterna. 4to. *Bas.*
Other Ed. *Bas.*, 1613 and 1617, 8vo, with additions.

1562. **Balduin** (Franc.) Responsio altera ad Johannem Calvinum. pp. 191. 8vo. *Colon. and Paris.*

——— ——— ——— Disputatio de cognitione hominis, in qua de peccato originali, de naturali hominis corruptione, de liberi arbitrii impotentia, de gratia regenerationis, et auxilio Spiritus sancti, tractatur. 8vo. *Genev.*

——— Consensus Pastorum Genevensium à Joh. Calvino expositus de æterna Dei Prædestinatione. 8vo. *Genev.*

[1563]. **Veron** (Joh.) A Frutefull Treatise of Predestination, and the Divine Providence of God. 16mo. *Lond.*
A rare little volume seldom found complete. Smith's copy sold for £2 10s. in 1867. The work was dedicated to "the most godlye, vertuous, and mightye Princes Elizabeth, by the grace of God, Queene of Englande," &c. It is in the form of a dialogue in which Albion represents England, "which being pulled agayne in too papystrye, by the braggynge prelates of the Pope's cleargye, is nowe reduced and broughte agayne in too the ryghte waye, by the meanes of Phylalethes, that is to saye, the louer of the truthe, whyche doothe here represente all the true preachers of Goddes woorde, vnto hym is added for a coadiutoure, and fellowe healper, Entrapelus. As for Dydimus, he is neyther hotte nor cold, yet in the latter end with Albion, he yeldeth vntoo the truth." The Author was a Calvinist.

——— **Smith** (Rich.) De Libero hominis arbitrio adv. Calvinum. 8vo. *Lond.*
The Author was a Roman Catholic, Regius Prof. of Divinity at Oxford.

——— **Fabricus** (John) De Providentia Divina. 8vo.
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Sirenius** (Julius) Tract. De Fato, contingentia, necessitate, providentia, præscientia, etc. Fol. and 4to. *Venet.*

——— Disputatio de originali peccato et libero arbitrio inter Matthiam Flacium et Vict. Strigelium publice Vinariæ..... contra Papistar. et Synergistar. corruptelas a 1560 habita ed. Si. Musæus. 4to. *S.L.*
As to the book, see Walch ii., 598.

——— **Flacius** (Matth.) Erzehlung, wie der hochwichtige und langwierige religions—streit Victorini in Thüringen endlich geschlichtet worden, allen liebhabern der wahrheit sehr nüzlich zu lesen. 4to.

——— **Baius** (Michael) De libero hominis arbitrio. 8vo. *Lovan.*
Not in Brit. Mus. In 1565, *Lovan.*, 8vo, he wrote on the condition of Adam, against Calvin. His collected works were first published, *Colon. Agrip.*, 1696, 4to ; but smaller portions, *Lovan.*, 1566, 8vo, and 1566, 12mo. "Baianisiani historia brevis," published *Lovan.*, 1699, 8vo. ; and the history of Bainsism, by Du Chasne, *Douay*, 1731, 4to. Dissert. on the Bulls against Baius, *Utrecht*, 1737, 8vo. 2 vols. See Berti (G. L.) 1747.

1563. Pia admonitio de decretis et canonibus Concilii Tridentini, scripta in gratiam hominum piorum, qui emendationem doctrinæ et cæremoniarum in Ecclesia per concilia faciendam expectant. 4to. *Francof.*

——— **Beda** (Ven.) Opera Omnia. 8 vols. *Bas.*

Another Ed., *Col. Agr.*, 1612, and 1688, fol. 8 vols. *Lond*, 1843–4, 12 vols. 8vo, by J. A. Giles, *LL D.*; Migne (J. P.) Tom. 90 and 95, 1844, &c. Lib. 1. in cantica canticorum [contra Julianum Pelagianum].

——— Etliche Schrifften und handlungen der Wittenbergischen Theologen und Vict. Strigelii, was zu halten sey von seiner Synergia. 4to. *Witteb.*

1564. **Cardan** (Jerome) In Septem Hippocratis Aphorismos Commentaria Eivsden De Venenorum differentiis, Item de Providentia Temporum liber. fol. *Bas.*

——— **Viret** (Pierre) Instruction Chretienne en la doctrine de la Foy et de l'Evangile, en la vraye Philosophie et Theologie.

The Author was one of the three great ministers of Geneva, with Calvin and Farel. Calvin being celebrated for his profound erudition, Farel for his zeal and vehemence, and Viret for his enchanting eloquence.

——— **Amsdorff** (Nicol.) Wider die synergiam Victor Strigelii. 4to. *Magdeb.*

See Schlusselburg's Catalog., hæretic, lib. v., p. 546, and Walch ii., 595. The above work is not in the Brit. Mus.

——— Wahrhaftiger und gründlicher summarien bericht etlicher prædicanten, wie und warum sie im 62 und 63, iahre in Thuringen sind ihres amts entsezet und zum theil veriagt worden, &c. 4to.

——— **Pays-Bas.**—Payæus (Didac.)?—Orthodoxarum Explicationum libri 10: viz., de Origine Societatis Jesu, de S. Scriptura, de Peccato, de Libero Arbitrio, &c., contra Chemnitium. 8vo. *Colon.*

——— **Balduin** (François) Responsio ad Calvinum et Bezam. pp. 170. 8vo. *Colon.*

——— **Horantius** (Fr.) Loci Catholici tum S.S. tum etiam Antiquorum Patrum pro Orthodoxa et Vetere Fide retinenda in quibus præcipua Institutionis Calvini Capita opertissimè confutantur. fol. *Venet.*

——— **Selneccerus** (Nic.) De Providentia Dei. 4to. *Lips.*

He also wrote a Commentary on all the Epistles of St. Paul, *Lipsiæ.*, 1595, which is not in the Brit. Mus., and also "De libro concordiæ," *Lips.*, 1581—2, and "Theses de Peccato Originis," *Lips.*, 8vo.

[15—]. **Calvinistic Articles.**—Fünff Calvinische Articul, darmit ein Christ, der in dem Calvinischen Glauben absterben will, sich in seinem Todbeth Trösten soll, *etc.* fol.

This is a satire on predestination. The above words are placed above a woodcut representing a man on his deathbed, on the upper part of which is disposed the text of the five articles and beneath it is placed their refutation.—See 1550.

1565. **Franco** (D.) De Gratia seu Beneficentia Dei, liber 12. 24mo. *Antr.*

The Author died 1609. Another Ed., *Friburg*, 1620, pp. xii. and 335, 16mo. No Ed. in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Viret** (Pierre) De la Providence Divine, touchant tout les Etats du Monde. 8vo. *Lugd.*

An Ed. in Germ, *Dusseldorff*, 1614, 12mo.

The Author was an able assistant in the reformation, and adopted Calvinistic views.

——— **Sainctes** (Claude de) Discours sur le Saccagement des Eglises Catholiques par les Heretiques anciens et nouveaux Calvinistes en 1562. 8vo. *Paris.*

[1565]. **Laynez** (James) MS. De Providentia, lib. XII.

A Jesuit, mentioned by De Bacher (v. 423), who assisted at the Colloquy of Poissy, and at the Council of Trent. He also was the Author of a work entitled "Dogmata et decreta de Gratia et Justificatione."

——— **Mencelius** (Hier.) Vom freyen willen des menschen. 8vo. *Isleb.*

——— **Autumnus** (Geo.) Luther's lehre vom freyen willen und bekehrung des menschen zu gott, aus seinen schriften gezogen. 4to. *Isleb.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Chytræus** (Duv.) Explicationes vocabulorum necessitatis, determinationis divinæ, Fati, contingentiæ, virium humanarum, liberi arbitrii. *Rostochii.*

Not in the Brit. Mus. This Ed. very rare. Another, *Lips.*, 1594, 8vo. Chytræus also wrote "Summa Doctrinæ de vera Dei agnitione, *Witteb.*, 1584, 8vo.

——— **Cassander** (Geo.) De Statu. Infantum, qui in Ecclesia nati citra Baptismi Sacramentum moriuntur. 8vo. *Colon.*

1566 **Crowley** (Rob.) An Apologie or Defence of those Englishe writers and Preachers which Cerberus, the three headed dog of Hell, chargeth with false Doctrine under the name of Predestination. 4to. *Lond.*

The work to which this is an answer, is unknown as a separate publication, though it was evidently in circulation at the time this reply was written; it is however completely reprinted in the above volume, and is a more favourable specimen of theological controversy than Crowley's reply to it. Crowley was a Fell. of Magdalen Coll., Oxford. He was made Archdeacon of Hereford, and in 1558 was collated to a prebendal stall in St. Paul's. He died 1588.

1566. **Horantius** (Franc.) Contra Calvinum. 8vo. *Paris.*

——— **Garcæus** (John) Tract. de Electione Dei et Induratione hominis. 8vo. *Paris.*

——— **Catharinus** (Ambrose) In omnes Pauli apostoli et alias VII. Canonicas Epistolas Commentaria. fol. *Venet.*

Not in the Brit. Mus. In these Commentaries he treats of Polemical questions and leaves, as he had done before, Augustine's system of Predestination and Grace. He refutes, however, the errors of the Pelagians, and is not entirely of the opinion of those who allow no gratuitous Predestination to glory, nor any grace in itself effectual. This opinion was opposed by Dominico Soto, and defended by Sixtus Senensis, &c.

1567. **Sainctes** (Claud. de) Declaration d'ancuns Athesmes de la doctrine de Calvin et Beze contre les premiers fondemens de la Chrêtienté. 8vo. *Paris.*

Rarissimis libris adnumeratur a S. Rev. J. Laur. Mosheimio in Historia Serveti.—See 1568.

——— **Dresserus** (Matt.) S. Basilius Magnus. Oratio: Quod Deus non sit author malorum. Conversa et explicata a M. D. pp. 88. 12mo. *Bas.*

Not in the Brit. Mus. Dresserus was a learned German, Prof. of Rhetoric at Leipsic, and died there in 1607. The above tract is rare.

——— **Sonnius** (F.) Demonstratio ex Verbo Dei et Patribus erroris cujusdam confessionis calvinisticæ, recens per has inferiores Germaniæ Regiones sparsæ. 8vo. *Lovanii.*

——— **Canisius** (Pet.) Summa Doctrinæ Christianæ, cum appendice de hominis lapsu, &c. 8vo. *Colon.*

The 1st Ed. of the Summa, but without the appendix, appeared in 1554. There have been numerous Ed., 1560, 16mo; 1561, 16mo; *Colon.*, 1556, 8vo, 1577, pp. 791, fol.; 1586, fol.; 1606, fol.; *Antv.*, 1567, 16mo; 1574, 8vo; 1587, 8vo; 1592, 12mo; 1601, 16mo; *Vindel.*, 1755, 12mo; *Aug. Vindel.*, 1833-34, 8vo; *Landish*, 1839. In French, *Paris*, 1865, 18mo. An English Transl., *St. Omers*, 1622, 18mo. The author was a learned Jesuit, died 1597.

——— **Lummius** (Jo. F.) De extremo Dei Judicio et Indorum Vocatione. 8vo. *Antv.*

Another Ed., *Venet.*, 1569, 8vo. Freytag in his Analecta was obliged to leave undecided the question (upon which authorities differed), whether this book treated of the conversio "Judæorum," or "Indorum," as, he says he was unable to obtain sight of a copy. A copy was in the collection of the Duc de la Vallière, ed. 1783 i, 212.

——— Bekantnis von der ewigen Gnadenwahl und Verordnung gottes zur Secligkeit an alle der reinen Augsburgischen confession Verwandten *i.e.* durch die Theologische Facultät zu Wittenberg. 4to. *Witteb.*

——— Beweis dass Strigelii declaration falsch, verführisch und verwerflich sey. *Vinar.*

1568. **Sainctes** (Claude de) Déclaration contre la doctrine de Calvin et de Beze. 8vo. *Paris.*

——— **Dore** (Pierre) Anti-Calvin avec un nouveau traité de nature et grace. 8vo. *Paris.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Spangenbergius** (Cyr.) Bericht und Erklärung der vii. Predigten, halben von Gott. Vorsehung und ewigen Gnadenwahl. 8vo. *Eisleb.*

——— **Flacius** (M. Illyricus) De Injustitia aut Peccato originali. 8vo. *Bas.*

——— **Flacius** (Matth.) Antwort auff etliche Schrifften Lasii, von der Erbsünde etc. 4to. *Ursel.*

——— **Lasius** (Christ.) Fundament wahrer und Christl. Bekehrung wider die Flacianische Klos-Busse. 8vo. *Franckf. an der Oder.*

Also author of "Prælibatio Flaciani Dogmatis, &c." *Witteb.* 8vo.

——— **Huber** (Sam.) Beschreibung des gansen Streits zwischen D. Hunnen und D. Hubern von der Gnadenwahl. 4to.

1569. **Grynæus** (John Jas.) Monumenta S. Patrum orthodoxographa. 8 vols. fol. *Bas.*

Vol. 5, Faustus Episcopus Galliæ. De libero arbitrio. Faustus was a native of Britain and Abbot of Levins in 443. He was Bp. of Riez in Provence 455. The above tract of Faustus was pub. also *Paris*, 1575, 1589, 1610. See Cave i, 453 Milner's Ch. His. He wrote against the doctrines of Election and Reprobation which pieces have been abridged by Du Pin. Faustus was banished from his See in 481, and died soon after. *See* Du Pin, Eccl. Hist. Cent. v. vol. iv.

——— **Eisengrein** (Mart.) De Certitudine Gratiæ Tractatus. 8vo. *Colon.*

Not in Brit. Mus.

——— **Flacius** (Mat.) De Occasionibus vitandi errorem in doctrina de essentia Justitiæ originalis. 8vo. *Bas.*

——— **Otton** (Anton.) Antwort auff Christ. Lasii rechte Klos-Busse und andere Landlügen. 8vo. *Eisleb.*

1570. **Aquinas** (Thomas) Opera Omnia. 17 vols. fol. *Romæ.*

Contains:—De Malo, de peccato originali—De providentia, de prædestinatione—De Voluntate—De libero arbitrio—De gratia—De Fato, &c. The above was the first complete Edition of his works. Other Ed., *Venet.*, 1593, 18 vols. fol.; see Ebert, No. 882; *Antv*, 1612, 19 vols. fol.; *Paris*, 1636—41, 23 vols. fol.; *Venet*, 1775, 28 vols. 4to; *Neapoli*, 1762—70, 16 vols. 4to; *Paris* (Vives), 1871—80, 34 vols. 4to; cura Bern. de Rubeis, *Venet.*, 1745, 28 vols. 4to; *Parmæ*, 1855—70, 24 vols. fol.

The first Ed. of the 1st. part of the Summa appeared without place or date about 1462, fol. (1466—70, *Basil*? see Hain, 1456, marked in recent catalogue at £3); and the 1st. Ed. with date *Mogunt.*, 1471, fol. The Summa or parts thereof, mostly of the 1st. part, also appeared *Esslinge*, 1472, fol.; *Padua*, 1473, fol., being the first book printed at this place; *Venet.*, 1477, 1478, 1482, 1483, 1484, 1489, 1490, 1493, 1496, 1497, 1500, all fol.; 1588, 5 vols. fol.; 1598, 5 vols. fol.; 1612, 5 vols.

fol.; 1755, 7 vols. 4to; 1758, 7 vols. 4to.; Impressa per Joannem Rubeum, 1497, fol.; *Basil.*, 1485, 2 vols. fol.; 1488, fol.; *Nuremb.*, 1496, 4 vols. fol.; *Pant.*, 1569, 3 vols. fol.; *Lugd.*, 1575, 5 vols. fol.; 1587, 4 vols. fol.; 1588, 6 vols. fol.; 1624, 6 vols. 8vo; 1633, 9 vols. 12mo; 1673, 10 vols. 16mo; 1677, fol.; 1683, 3 vols. fol.; 1686, 5 vols. fol.; 1701, 12 vols. 12mo; 1702, 3 vols. fol.; *Colon. Agr.*, 1622, fol.; 1640, 1641, fol.; *Colon.*, 1604, 3 vols. fol.; *Antv.*, 1575, 4 vols. fol.; 1624, fol.; *Duaci*, 1623, fol.; *Patavii*, 1698, 5 vols. fol.; 1736, 5 vols, 12mo. 1760, 18 vols. 12mo.; 1712, 12 vols. 8vo; *Paris*, 1645, fol.; 1663, 2 vols. fol., and 10 vols. 12mo; (Migne), 1843—63, 5 vols in 3, 8vo; 1849, 2 vols. 8vo; 1867, 8 vols. 8vo; (Vives) 1864, 9 vols. 18mo; 1882, 8 vols. 8vo; *Romæ*, 1783, 10 vols. fol.; *Parmæ*, 1852—55, 14 vols, 8vo; *Barri Ducis*, 1864—69, 8 vols, 8vo; 1873, 8 vols, 8vo; *Luxemburgi*, 1870, 8 vols. 8vo. In French with notes by l'Abbe Drioux, *Paris*, 1851, 8 vols, 8vo; *Paris*, (Vives) 1854, 16 vols. 8vo, by l'Abbé Carmagnolle Lat. and French, 1860, 20 vols. 8vo. His tract "De Præscientia et Prædestinatione," issued with "Opuscula," Cajetani (Card.) *Lugd*, 1538, fol. Aquinas obtained a celebrity which eclipsed that of almost every writer of his age. He was b. 1224, and d. 1274. The appellations of Doctor Universalis and Angelicus have been applied to him. He was a Realist. His Summa Theologiæ was the first attempt at a complete system of Theology comprehending one of Ethics, and it is enriched with many solid and wise observations without the observance of any rigorous order in its details. He occupies a similar position in Theology to that which Lord Coke occupies in English Jurisprudence. He taught that evil, or the negation of good is necessary to the completion of the Universal System, and that God is only the accidental cause of evil, see p. 34 and 150.

1570. **Accidentariorum** Theologorum Spiritus Vertiginis. 4to.

——— **Selneccerus** (Nicol.) Verantwortung auff der Flacianer Lästerung in ihren verdächtigen Actis des IV., Colloquii zu Altenburg ausgesprenget; *Item*: Antwort auff des *Cœlestini*, Schmähwort. 4to. *Leipz.*

——— Colloquium Altemburgense de articulo Justificationis, inter Electoris Saxoniæ Theologos annis 1568 et 1569, habitum; adjecti sunt duo articuli de libero arbitrio et de adiaphoris, sicut eos in continuatione colloquii dicti Theologi proposituri fuissent. 4to. *Jenæ.*

——— **Heerbrandus** (Jac.) Disp. de Elect. et Prædestinatione Divina. 4to. *Tub.*

——— **Hamboldus** (Hier.) Oratio de Servo Hominis Arbitrio. 8vo. *Ratis.*

——— **Wittenbergischer** Bericht wider die Flacianer. 4to. *Witteb.*

——— Bekantnis vom freien Willen so im Colloquio zu Altenberg hat sollen fürgebracht werden. 4to. *Jenæ.*

——— **Wigandus** (Joh.) Controversiæ: an Peccatum Originis sit subtantia! Declaratio. 4to.

——— Derer Theologen zu Jena Bekäntnis von V. streitigen artickeln. 4to. *Jenæ.*

1570. **Heshusius** (Tilemam.) Epistola ad M. Flacium Illyr. de Controversia, an peccatum originis sit substantia. 4to. *Jenæ.*

Also wrote same year "VIII. Predigten vom Erkantnis Gottes," *Jenæ*, 4to.

——— **Flacius** (Mathias) Defensio Doctrinæ de Originali Justitia ac Injustitia aut Peccato. 8vo. *Bas.*

——— **Flacius** (Mat.) Kurtze bekänntnis von etlichen stücken christlichen glaubens und von der erbsünde. 4to. *Magdeb.*

——— **Flacius** (Mat.) Demonstrationes evidentissime doctrinæ de essentia imaginis Dei et diaboli. 8vo. *Bas.*

1571. **Sylvius** (Æneas.) Opera. *Bas.*

Lib. De Præscientia Dei et de Fato. Not apparently in Brit. Mus.

——— **Heshusius** (Til.) Testimonia Augustini de peccato originis. 4to. *Jenæ.*

——— **Flacius** (Mat.) Orthodoxa confessio de originali peccato qua solide respondetur calumniis. 8vo. *Argent.*

——— **Flacius** (Mat.) Christliche bekänntnis von der erbsünde, wieder das pelagianische und sophistische accidens. 4to. *Ursel.*

——— **Flacius** (Mat.) Evidentissimæ aliquot demonstrationes, controversiam de essentia originalis peccati determinantes. 4to.

——— **Wigandus** (Jo.) Commonefactio de novis monstris et fæcundis in doctrina de peccato. 4to. *Jenæ.*

——— **Wigandus** (Jo.) Von der erbsünde, lere aus gottes wort...und aus D. Luthers büchern. 4to. *Jenæ.*

——— **Wigandus** (Jo.) Bericht ob die erbsunde sey ein wesen, aus dem catechismo durch einen frommen christen geschrieben. 4to. *Jenæ.*

Neither of the last three works are in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Heshusius** (Til.) Gegenbericht auf Flacii kurtzes bekänntnis von der erbsünde. 4to. *Jenæ.*

This Book is under date 1591 in Lipenius Bibl. Real. Theol. i. 698; but evidently by mistake.

——— Endlicher bericht und erhlärung, etc. 4to. *Witteb.*

Treats not only of original sin, but also of free will. *See* Walch, ii., 601.

——— **Spangenbergius** (Cyriac.) Kurtzer bericht fur die einfæltigen von dem ietzigen streit uber der lere von der erbsünde. 4to.

——— **Cradocke** (Edward) Discourse of God's Providence. 16mo. *Lond.*

Pub. *Lond.*, 1572, 8vo, under the title of "Shippe of assured safetie wherein we may sayle without danger toward the land of the living promised to the true Israelites; conteyning a discourse of God's Providence."

1571. **Bornatus** (Gregorius) De libero hominis arbitrio, etc. 8vo. *Brixiæ.*
Ed. with a prefatory letter, by F. Franciscius. A rare work.

——— **Flacius** (Matth.) De Peccato originali.

——— ——— Bericht von seinem Christl. Schreiben wider das Sophistis. Accidens. 4to.

——— Colloquium de Peccato originis inter Jac. Andræa et Matth. Flacium. *Argent.*
Another Ed. *Friburgo*, 1575, 4to.

——— ——— Spiritus sancti figuræ; aut typi, originale peccatum depingentes; refutatio pelagianorum spectrorum. 4to.
Another Ed., 1572.

——— **Crellius** (Paul.) Commonefactio de Verbis; credo remissionem peccatorum et de dicto Pauli; Gratiâ estis salvati. 4to. *Witteb.*

1572. Vom Flickwerck Irenæi, wiegar ungereimt er sich unterstehet der Manichæer Schwärmeren zu beschönen, &c. 4to. *Jenæ.*

——— **Flacius** (Matth.) Antwort auf allerley sophistereyen des pelagianischen accidentis. 4to. *Ursel.*

——— ——— Angelus tenebrarum detectus, seu de justitia essentiali contra accidentarios. 8vo. *Ursel.*

——— ——— De sententia Augustini et Manichæorum in controversia peccati. 4to. *Ursel.*

——— ——— Refutatio sententiæ Musæi de originali peccato, cum responsione ad Heshusii invectivam. 4to. *Ursel.*
Also "Amolitio xx errorum, quos Heshusius, Flacio falso objicit."—S.L. 4to.

——— ——— Examen novæ sententiæ Musæi de peccato originali. 4to. *Eisleb.*
Also "Censuræ de Libro Unterricht," S. L 4to.

——— ——— Declaratio sententiæ de peccato originali.

——— ——— Compendiaria expositio doctrinæ de essentia peccati originalis. 4to. *Ursel.*

——— ——— Kurtze wiederlegung des poetischen dialogi von der erbsünde, &c. 4to.

——— **Wigandus** (Jo.) De peccato originali. 4to. *Jenæ.*
Also author of "Tract. de homine integro, corrupto, renato et glorificato." *Jenæ*, 1572, 8vo.

——— ——— De Peccato originis repetitio doctrinæ sanæ ex verbo Dei, corpore Thuringicæ Ecclesiæ, et monumentis M. Lutheri, et controversiæ; an peccatum originis sit substantia? 4to. *Jenæ.*

1572. **Wigandus** (Jo.) Septem spectrorum Manichæorum discussio. 8vo. *Jenæ.*
Neither of the last three works in Brit. Mus. Other works on the Manichæans. Canisius (Hen.) *Ingolst*, 1603, 4to; Damascenus (Joh.) *Basil*, 1578, 8vo; Didymus Alexandrinus, *Ingoldst*, 1604, 4to; *Par.*, 1610; Franciscus (Mart.) *Buddissin*, 1678, 4to; Horbius (Joh. Hen.) *Argent. et Francof*, 1670, 4to; Schlusselburgus (Cour.) *Franc.* 1597, 8vo; Siculus (Pet.) *Paris*, 1639; *Ingolst*, 1604, 4to; Spangenbergius (Cyr.) *Ursellis*, 1578, 4to; Stravchius (Ægid.) *Witteb.*, 1656, 4to, and 1660; Victorinus (Mar. Fab.) *Paris*, 1630, 8vo; Zachariæ Episc. Mytyl., *Ingolst.*, 1604, 4to; *Par.*, 1610

——— **Heshusius** (Til.) Defensio piæ sententiæ Augustini, quod peccatum originis non sit substantia. 4to. *Jenæ.*

——— **Mosellanus** (Joh.) Responsio ad Argumenta Spangenbergii de Peccato originali. 4to. *Jenæ.*

——— Refutatio Pelagianorum Spectrorum Spiritus S. Figuræ et Typi Originale Peccatum depingentes. 4to. *Ursellis.*

——— Manichæo Pelagiani accidentia absurda non coacta, sed inevitabili necessitate consequentia. 4to.

——— **Heshusius** (Til.) Epistola ad Matth. Flacium de peccato originis. 4to. *Jenæ.*

——— ——— Antidotum contra Flacii dogma peccatum originis esse substantiam. *Jenæ.*
Another Ed., 1576, 4to.

——— ——— Propositiones de peccato originis contra Manichæos et Pelagianos. 4to. *Jenæ.*

——— **Musæus** (Sim.) Sententia de peccato originis, quod non sit substantia sed extranea ejus corruptio, tam juxta materiam quam Formam. 4to. *Jenæ.*

——— Der Theologen zu Jena Erinnerung von D. Cœlestini heimlich ausgesprengtem Büchlein von der Erbsünde. 4to. *Jenæ.*

——— **Melissander** (Casp.) Confessio de certamine Faciano. 4to. *Jenæ.*
Another Ed. by Jo. H. Ackerus, *Rudelst.*, 1712, 8vo.

——— **Spangenbergius** (Cyr.) Erklærung von der erbsünde, für die einfœltigen. 4to. *Eisleb.*
A Lutheran.

——— ——— Apologia von der erbsünde und gründlichen beweis, das die erbsünde nicht ein accidens unserer verderbten natur und wesen sey. 4to. *Eisleb.*
Lipenius, *Bibl. Real. Theol.*, ii, 460, gives the date as 1573, but i. 696, as above.

——— ——— Antwort auff die landlungen, damit er und etliche andere mehr zur unbilligkeit beschworet worden. 4to. *Eisleb.*
Lipenius gives the date as 1573.

1572. Christliche und tapfere antwort Volraths grafen zu Mansfeld auf das unchristliche schreiben D. Wigandi. 4to.

——— **Petreus** (Joh.) Warnung und Vermahnung das man sich an das unauffhörliche Schreyen der Flacianer, damit sie die Lehr der Meisnischen Pfaffen-Kirchen richten und verdammen nicht kehren soll. 4to. *Witteb.*

——— **Irenæus** (Christ.) Bekænntnis von diesen zweyen propositionen oder reden: peccatum originis est substantia, &c. 4to.

——— Kurtze antwort auf das flick, lœster und possenwerck der reuischen theologen, so sie wieder das bekænntnis von der erbsünde Irenæi, Wolffii, Schneiden, Franci haben lassen ausgehen. 4to.

——— Der Wahrhaftigen, lehre von der erbsünde, doctor Martin Luthers, daraus klar zu sehen, dass dieselbe nicht sey ein accidens. 4to. *Eiseb.*

——— Ein œffentliches und wahrhaftiges. zeugnis von der disputation zwischen Matthia Flacio Illyrico und etlichen wiederwærtigen. 4to. *Ursel.*

——— **Aretius** (Bened.) Nova duo Lemmata, prius de Electione, &c. 12mo. *Bernæ Helvet.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— Disputatio; an Peccatum originale sit substantia vel accidens? 4to. *Regiom. Bor.*

——— Derer Jenischen Theologen Erinnerung von D. Cœlestini heimlich ausgesprengtem Büchl. von der Erbsünde. 4to. *Jenæ.*

——— **Luther** (Mart.) Klare und helle Zeugnis das die Erbsünde nicht sey das Wesen des Menschen; per Hesshusium zusammen getragen. 4to. *Jenæ.*

——— ——— Manichæi, Pelagian. Accidentia absurda, non coacta sed inevitabili Necessitate consequentia, opposita Sobonistarum Monstris. 4to.

1573. [**Irenæus** (Christ.)] Erklærung aus D. Luthers Schriften, was für ein unterschied sey zwischen gottes und des teuffels werck in dem menschen. 4to.

——— Beweis aus gottes wort und schriften Lutheri, dass wir menschen auch nach dem fall nicht des teufels, sondern gottes geschæpse, oder creaturen seyn, &c. 4to.

——— **Sarcerius** (Guil.) Bekænntnis von der erbsünde. 4to.

1573. Acta des auf dem Mansfeldischen schlosse zwischen Flacio, Irenæo Reineccero und Mencelio, Rhodio, &c., 1572, gehaltenen colloquii zu Mansfeld. 4to.

——— **Spangenbergius** (C.) Christliche und kurze Bekænntnüs von etlichen Religionis Articlen wider die falschen Ausleger. 4to.

——— **Irenæus** (Christ.) Beweis aus Gottes Wort das wir Menschen auch nach dem Fall nicht des Teuffels sondern Gottes Geschöpff seyn. 4to.

——— **Flacius** (Mat.) Solida refutatio vanissimorum sophismatum, calumniarum et figmentorum atque etiam deterrimorum errorum antidoti Heshusii et aliorum neopelagianorum scriptorum. 4to.

——— **Wigandus** (Jo.) Rationes cur hæc propositio; peccatum originis est corrupta natura, in controversiis cum Manichæis nequeat consistere. 4to. *Jenæ.*

——— ——— De Imagine Dei in homine et de larva satanæ. 8vo. *Jenæ.*

Neither of the last two works in Brit. Mus.

——— **Hugonius** (Jo.) Gründlicher und klarer bericht von der erbsünde. 4to.

Another Ed., *Regenspurg*, 1574, 4to.

——— **Spangenbergius** (C.) Zwo hochnothwendige fragen an die heilige christliche kirche uber die lere von der erbsünde, ete. 4to.

——— Bericht wieder Spangenbergs bekænntnis. 4to.

——— **Prætorius** (Zach.) Von der erbsünde. 4to.

——— **Mencelius** (Hier.) Erklærung wieder Spangenbergs predigt. 4to.

——— Volraths und Carols, grafen zu Mansfeld, endliche erklærung von der erbsunde. 4to.

——— Historia, wie, wenn und woruber sich die trennung unter den predigern in der grafschaft Mansfeld zugetragen. 4to.

——— **Flacius** (Matth.) Utiles quædam regulæ de Prædicatione legis et cognitione Peccati Additis causis, cur essentia originalis Peccati explicanda sit. 4to. *Ursel.*

1574. Eislebischen Prediger Verantwortung auf die Schrifte so unter dem Nahmen Hr. Volraden und Hr. Carln Gebrüdern und Grafen zu Mansfeld in Truck gegeben. 4to. *Eisleb.*

——— **Spangenbergius** (C.) Ablenung der falschen und unverschœmten auflage, als solte Spangenberg von seiner vorigen lere der erbsünde abgefallen seyn. 4to. *Mansfeld*

1574. **Spangenbergius** (C.) Widerlegung des ungegründeten beweises der Eislebischen prædicanten, darin sie die Mansfeldischen den Manichæern vergleichen. 4to. *Mansfeld.*

——— ——— Ein gewaltige ritterliche that eines accidentischen vulcani, M. Martini Fabri, wie er unmenschlicher weise das allerbeste und edelste buch, die heilige bibel, mit menschen koth besudelt, &c. 4to. *Mansfeld.*

——— **Faber** (Mart.) Wahrhaftigen gegenbericht auf die greulichen calumnien M. Cyriaci Spangenbergi. 4to.

——— **Spangenbergius** (C.) Censuræ der propheten, christi, der apostel, Lutheri und auderer vom streit über der lehre von der erbsünde.

——— Erzehlung und beweis, in welchen stücken die mansfelder prediger sich mit den alten manichæern vergleichen. 4to. *Eisleb.*

——— **Fabricius** (Andr.) Hauptlehre von der erbsünde.

——— Der superintendenten und ubrigen prediger verantwortung wieder Volraths und Carols, grafen zu Mansfeld, endliche erklærung. 4to.

——— Volraths und Carols, gegenmandat, gegen der Fr. withe zu Mansfeid, mandat. 4to.

——— Graf Vollraths und Carols bekænntnis ihrer lehre. 4to.

——— **Irenæus** (Christ.) Censuren und Urtheil derer heiligen Propheten und Apostel mit Erklärung Lutheri, vom Streit über der Lehre von der Erbsünde. 4to. *Mansfeld.*

——— **Haubolds** (Hier.) Bericht warumb es ikeund zuthun sey in dem Streit von der Erbsünde. 4to.

Another Ed., 1589, 8vo.

——— **Peristerius** (Sim.) Bekäntnis auff den fürgelegten extract eines Raths der Stadt Regensburg von dem gegenwärtigen Streit der Erbsünde. 4to.

——— II. Fragen an die Christliche Kirchen über die lehre von der Erbsünde von etlichen Mannsfeldischen Predigern gestellt. 4to.

——— Ernste erinnerung und strafschrift an Mencelium, Fabricium, Roth, etc. 4to.

——— Bekænntnis von der erbsünde.

——— **Schreiber** (Valent.) Antwort auf Sachs und Kraffts unerfindliche auflagen, damit sie ihn über dem streitt von der erbsünde zur unbilligkeit beschweret. 4to.

——— **Otton** (Anton.) Præservatio wider, die trunckenen bauren von der erbsünde. 4to.

——— ——— — Unverdiente beschuldigung wieder M. Fabricium.

1574. Ob diese rede und lehre, die erbsünde ist unsere verderbte natur und wesen, in doctor Martini Luthers schriften gegründet und zu finden; oder nicht. 4to.

——— **Dornvogelius** (Mid.) De Prædestinatione et reprobatione disputatio. Pres. Greg. a Valentia, S. J., Resp. M.D. pp. 16. 4to. *Dilinge.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Flacius** (Mat.) De origine controversiæ de originali peccato ad veritatis cognitionem prorsus necessaria. 4to or 8vo. *Ursel.*

——— **Wigandus** (Jo.) Warnung von II. Jrthumer der neuen Manichæer, I. das der teuffel ein schöpffer sey, menschlichen wesens, II., das gott sey ein schöpffer der sünden. 4to. *Ratisb.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Andreæ** (Jac.) Epistola de peccato originis. 4to.

——— **Andreæ** (Jac.) Sendbrieff an Math. Flacium von der erbsünde. 4to. *Tub.*

Another Ed. *Tub.*, 1585, 4to. The author was a Lutheran divine, d. 1589.

——— **Caundishe** (Richard) The Image of Nature and Grace; containing the whole course and condition of Man's Estate. 8vo. *Lond.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Valentia** (Gregory de) De Prædestinatione et reprobatione. *Ingolst.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

The author was a Spanish Theologian and a Jesuit, d. 1603.

——— **Spangenbergius** (C.) Erste Erinnerung und Straffschrifft an M. Hier. Mencelium. 4to.

1575. Von der abfall von der wahren lehre.

[1575]. **Reinecherus** (Paul.) Methodica probatio propositionis, quod peccatum sit substantia.

——— **Opit** (Jos.) Bekænntnis von der erbsunde.

——— **Colerus**—Historia disputationis; seu potius colloquii inter Jacobum Colerum et Matthiam Flacium Illyricum de peccato originis. 4to. *Berol.*

Another Ed. by Greg. Langemack, *Sundii*, 1726, 8vo. None of these ed. in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Andreæ** (Jac.) Disp. de Electione et Prædestinatione Divina. 4to. *Tub.*

Another Ed., 1586.

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Musculus** (Andr.) Von der Leiter Jacobs, dar auff in diesen gefährlichen Zeiten aus allem Unglück.....zu vergewissern. 8vo. *Nuremb.*

1575.—**Flacius** (Matth.) Defensio veræ et Lutheranæ de originali Peccato sententiæ, &c.
Another Ed., 1576, 4to. S.L.

——— ——— Leidipredigt zu Eschwege von Caspar. Heldelino gehalten. 4to.

——— **Irenæus** (Christ.) Censuren D. M. Luthers, Pomarii, Philippi, Brentii, Regii, und viele derer Theologen einhelliger Consens, von dem streitigen Artickel der Erbsünde das III. Theil. 4to. *Mansfeld.*

——— **Mencelius** (Hierom.) Lehre von der Erbsünde. 4to.

——— **Spangenberg** (C.) Beweis das die wahre Lutherische lehre (Erbsünde sey die verderbte natur und Wesen) von Hier. Mencelio noch nicht umgestossen sey.

[1575]. **Nicholas** (Hen.) Comœdia, or work in Ryme containing an interlude of minds witnessing to Man's Fall from God and Christ. 12mo.
Ordered to be burned 22 Eliz. Not in Brit. Mus.

1575. **Capite-Fontium** (Christ. de) Confutatio Epistolæ cujusdam contra Liberum Arbitrium et Merita. 8vo. *Antv.*
Another Ed. *Romæ*, 1576, 8vo.

——— Sept dialogues auxquels sont examinez cent soixante quatorze erreurs des Calvinistes. 8vo. *Paris.*

——— **Andreæ** (Jacob) Bericht von der Erbsunde. 4to. *Tub.*
Not in Brit. Mus.

——— **Spangenberg** (C.) Erbieten, beneben kurtzer wiederholung seiner vorigen christlichen bekænntnis von der erbsünde. 4to. *Mansfeld.*

——— ——— Kurtze antwort auf D. Jac. Andreæ bericht von der erbsünde. 4to.
The first Ed. was 1573, 4to, see Lipenius i, 696.

——— Gewisse neue zeitung von der neun wochen unerhœrten hœllischen inquisition und trübseligen zustand der kirchen zu Mansfeld. 4to.

——— Colloquium inter D. Jac. Andreæ et Matth. Flacium. *Arg.*, 1471. Institutum. 4to. *Tub.*

——— **Spangenberg** (C.) Gegenbericht auf Jac. Andreæ bericht von der erbsünde. 4to.
A 2nd Ed., 1576.

1576. Propositiones quibus vera Doctrina de Peccato originali perspicue explicatur, &c. 4to.

——— **Valentia** (Gregory de) De excellenti divinæ gratiæ natura. *Ingolst.*
Another Ed. same place, 1577, 4to. Neither in Brit. Mus.

1576. **Calvin** (John) Two Godly and notable sermons preached in the yeere 1555. The one.....the other touchying the most comfortable assurance of oure salvation in Chryste Jesu. Translated out of Frenche into Englyshe, B.L. 8vo. *Lond.*

[1576]. **Gilby** (Anthony) A Briefe Treatise with certayne Answers to the objections of the Adversaries of this doctrinie [of predestination]. 8vo.

——— **Schnepffius** (Theod.) De Peccato Originis. 4to. *Tubing.*
Also Author of "De Peccato Origin. quod non recte dicatur substantia."—*Tubing.*

——— XXX hochwichtige erhebliche auch genugsam und wohlgegründe tettrsachen warum man diejenigen so die lehren das Adami hinterlassenes Erbstücke oder Erbsünde sey unsere verderbte Natur und Wesen nicht könne noch solle als Kätzer, &c., verdammen vielweniger als feindliche verfolgen. 4to.

——— Bericht Bürgermeister und Raths der Stadt Lindau erstlich von wegen etlicher daselbst entuhrlaubten Prædicanten (2) samt dem Gespräch vom Articul der Erbsünde über den neuerweckten Streit, &c. 4to. *Tub.*

——— **Irenæus** (Christ.) Testimonia illustria de Homine, quis ante Lapsum fuerit, et quis nunc post lapsum extra christum. 8vo.

——— **Peltanus** (Theod.) De Originali Peccato et Christi Satisfactione. 4to. *Colon.*
Very rare.

——— **Flacius** (Mat.) Defensio veræ et Lutheranæ de Originali peccato sententiæ. 4to.

1577. **Ballionius** (Lelius) Tract. de Prædestinatione. Sm. 8vo. *Flor.*
Rare, not in the Brit. Mus. The Author was a Roman.

——— **Bolsec** (Hier. Hermes.) Histoire de la Vie, Mœurs, Actes, Doctrine Constance et mort de Jean Calvin. 8vo. *Paris.*
Editions of this work appeared at *Lyons* in 1578, at *Cologne*, 1580, and again at *Lyons* in 1664, 8vo, and 1875, 8vo. In Latin, *Coloniæ*, 1582, pp. 120, 8vo.

——— **Andreæ** (Jac.) Oratio de Instauratione studii Theologici in Academia Wittebergensi, secundum Doctrinam Lutheri. 4to. *Tub.*
Not in Brit. Mus.

——— **Zanchius** (Hier.) De Natura Dei, sive Divinis Attributis libri quinque. fol. *Heidelb.*
This Ed. not in Br. Mus. Reprinted *Neost.*, 1590, 4to, and giving vol 2 of his Opera Omnia theologia 1619, fol. 8 vols.
He was buried in the College Chapel at St.

Peter's, Heidelberg, where a stone was set up with this inscription :—

Hieronymi hic sunt condita ossa Zanchii,
Itali ; exulantis, Christi amore, a patria ;
Qui Theologus quantus furit et Philosophus,
Testantur hoc, quos voce docuit in Scholis
Quique audiere Eum docentem ecclesias.
Nunc ergo, quamvis hinc migrarit Spiritu,
Claro tamen nobis remansit nomine.
Decessit A. MDXC., Die 19 Novemb.

1577. **Hamilton** (Arch.) Dialogus de Confusione Sectæ Calvinianæ apud Scotica Ecclesiæ Nomen ridiculè usurpantis. 8vo. *Paris.*

[1577]. **Pereira** (Franc.) MS. De Gratia.

A Jesuit, a teacher of theology at the college of Evera, in which place this manuscript is preserved De Bacher, iv. 538.

——— **Petrarca** (Franc.) De Remediis utriusque fortunæ libri 2. 8vo. *Lugd.*

Other Editions, *Lugd.*, 1595, 16mo ; and *Roterodami*, 1649, 12mo ; and in Opera, 4 vols, *Bas.*, 1554, 1581. It first appeared with other works, *Basil*, 1496, fol. ; and separately [*Argent.*], printed by Henr. Eggesteyn, without date, see Hain, 12790. Again, *Cremonæ*, 1493, fol. ; S.L., 1493, 4to. In Spanish before 1500, S.L., 4to; see Hain, 12793, 12795,. The 1st Ed. of his Opera, *Daventriæ*, 1494, fol.

——— **Spangenberg** (C.) Antwort auf der Eislebischen theologen. 4to.

On original sin.

——— ——— Kleine antwort auf die vermeinte abfertigung der eislebischen prediger. 4to.

——— Abfertigung des spangenbergischen irrthums von der erbsünde. 4to.

Islebienses theologi licet in commune certamen cum Spangenbergio descenderent ; præcipuas tamen partes Hieronymus Mencelius, antea a Flacii sententia haud alienus, suscepit; nec solum sacerdotum islebiensium sed suo quoque nomine libellos atque opuscula adversus Spangenbergium in lucem emisit. In illis locum habent. *grund der lehre* 1573, *lugengeist Spangenbergs*, 1574, contra Spangenbergii *Mencelii abfall und wiederruf*, 1573, 4to ; *lehre von der erbsunde und ob er von gottes wort abgefallen*, 1574; *wiederlegung der neuen spangenbergischen bekenntnis*, 1575 ; *deutlicher bericht, wie sich christen in dem streit von der erbsunde zu verhalten, an die kirche in Mansfeld.*—Walch ii., 603, 604.

——— Summa der Lehre von der Erbsünde ordentlich und einfältig aus gewissem Grunde Gottes Worts in DCLXII Schlusreimen gestellet. 4to.

1578. **Castalio**, or **Castelio** (Seb.) Annot. in Cap. IX. ad Romanos. 8vo. *Aresdorsii.*

Another Ed., *Goudae*, 1613, 8vo.

——— ——— Dialogi IV. ; de Prædestinatione, Electione, Libero Arbitrio, et Fide. 8vo. *Aresdorsii.*

Another Ed. was published at *Gouda*, in 8vo, in 1613, and another *Francof.*, 1696, 8vo. "Premiere edition fort rare."—*Clement.* The author is best known for his translation of the Bible which he dedicated to Ed. VI. The 1st Ed., *Bas.*, 1551, fol., is very rare. He was a learned Protestant and Prof. of Greek at Basle, d. 1563.

1578. **Wolfius** (Joh.) De Christiana Perseverantia. 8vo. *Tiguri.*

Not in Brit. Mus.

——— **Beza** (Theod.) Display of Popish Practises in hatched Pelagianisme, wherein is cleared the truth of God's Eternall Predestination, translated by Will. Hopkinson. 8vo. *Lond.*

Not in Brit. Mus.

——— **Socinus** (Faustus) Disputatio de Statu primo Hominis ante lapsum. *Florent.*

Other Ed. *Recoviæ*, 1609, 4to. Also in vol 2, p. 257, of "Opera Omnia," *Irenop.*, 1656, 2 vols, fol.

——— **Danæus** (Lamb.) Paratitla in D. Augustini tomos duos præcipuos, sive in libros contra Manichæos.....et Pelagianos. 8vo. *Genevæ.*

——— **Heidenreichs** (Joh.) V. Predigten von einigen Versühn. Opffer Gottes und Marien Sohns. 8vo. *Gorliz.*

——— **Peristerius** (Sim.) Retractation der anno MDLXXIV. gestellten Antwort von der Haupt. Frage des Streits von der erbsünde. 4to. *Regensburg.*

——— **Wigandus** (Jo.) Rationes cur hæc propositio peccatum hominis et corrupta Natura, in controversia cum Manichæis nequeat consistere. 4to. *Jenæ.*

1579. **Calvin** (John) Thirteene Sermons entreating of the free election of God in Jacob, and of reprobation in Esau, translated by J. Fielde. 4to. *Lond.*

At the end of the Sermon is "An Ansuere to a libel against Predestination."

——— **Rogers** (Tho.) The Catholic Doctrine of the Church of England. An Exposition of the 39 Articles.

Another Ed., *Lond.*, 1639, 4to.

——— **Mazzoronus** (Marc. Ant.) Disp. de Prædestinatione et Reprobatione. *Paris.*

——— **Smetonus** (Tho.) Responsio ad Archieb. Hamiltoni Dialogum de Confusione Calvin. Sectæ apud Scotos, ex eximii Veri Jo. Knoxii, Scotii, Ecclesiæ Instauratoris, vera extremæ Vitæ et Obitus Historia. 4to. *Edinb.*

The Hebrew and Greek quotations are written in, shewing that no fount of either character was then in use in Scotland.

——— **Spangenberg** (C.) Historia von der giftigen secte der manichæer. 4to.

——— **Ballionius** (Lelius) Tract. de peccato originali. 8vo. *Florent.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Grynæus** (Jo. Jac.) Synopsis historiæ hominis ; seu de prima hominis origine, ejus corruptione, reconciliatione cum Deo, et æterna salute, &c. 8vo. *Basiliæ.*

Also Author of "Exegesis Epit. ad Rom.," 1591, which is not in the Brit. Mus.

1579. **Huberus** (Sam.) In Cap. IX, X, and XII, Epist. ad Rom. 8vo. *Ursel.*

——— **Klarer** Bericht von der Erbsünde; ob si eine Substans oder Accidens sey und was fur ein Accidens. 4to. *Witteb.*

——— **Heshusius** (Tilem.) Antidotum contra impium dogma Matthæi Flacci. 4to. *Jenæ.*

——— **Hunnius** (Ægid.) De Lapsu primorum parentum. *Marp.*

Bathasar (Hen.) wrote also on the same subject a book without date, see Walch's Bibl. Theo., i, 85, and Abichtius (Geo.) a work without date entitled "De Sapientia et bonitate, Dei circa lapsum Adami," which is not in the Brit. Mus.

1580. **Martyr** (Pet.) De Libero Arbitrio. fol.

A translation appeared in 1583, in fol. Martyr also wrote on Providence, Predestination, and the cause of sin, and also on the Romans in 1568, a work which though in the Bodleian is not in the Brit. Mus. He received the degree of D.D. from the University of Oxford, and was for three years there Prof. of Divinity. He died in Zurich in 1562.

——— **Sirenius** (Jul.) Compendium de prædestinatione ac reprobatione, duobus libellulis distinctum. 4to. *Venet.*

——— **Pfeihofers** (Leon.) Lehr-und Trost Büchlein. 8vo. *Hall in Sachs.*

Other Editions *Coburg*, 1595; *Leipz.*, 1603.

——— **Pezelius** (Christ.) Erklärung des CVII Psalms. 8vo. *Neost.*

(On Providence).

——— **Ævolus** (Cæs.) Tractatus de Divinis Attributis. 4to. *Venet.*

——— **Irenæus** (Christ.) Adami des Ersten Patriarchen Lehr und Predigt so er vom Bilde Gottes darzu er anfänglich erschaffen, von seinem Erbfall verderbter Natur und Erbsünde, von der tröstlichen Verheissung des Weibes-Samen, &c., seinen Kindern und Kindes-Kindern gethan. 8vo. *Ursel.*

1581. **Foxe** (John) Concerning Man's Election to Salvation. 8vo. *Lond.*

The Author was the well known Martyrologist, and a Calvinist.

——— **Carthagena** (Franc.) Tract. de Prædestinatione et Reprobatione Angelorum et Hominum. 8vo. *Romæ.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

The Author was a Roman Catholic.

——— **Gurney** (Arth.) His dialogue touching God's Providence and Man's Free Will. 8vo. *Lond.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Gyfford** (Geo.) Four Sermons upon the seven cheefe vertues or principal effects of Faith and the doctrine of Election. 8vo. *Lond.*

Reprinted 1584 and 1598. "A very noted preacher, and one most admirably well versed in several sorts of learning which were rare, and much in esteem in his time, but withal a great enemy to Popery."—*Athen. Oxon.*

1581. **Andreæ** (Jacob) Gewissheit der christlichen lehre aller reiner theologen und kirchendiener. 4to. *Tubing.*

(Original sin).

——— **Beza** (Theod.) A Treatise on Predestination. 8vo. *Lond.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

Also contained in his Tractationes Theologicæ, *Gen.*, 1582, 3 vols, fol., vol 1, p. 337, "De æterna Dei prædestinatione contra Seb. Castellionem"—and vol 3, p. 402, De Prædestinatione. The above Treatise also separately in Latin. *Genevæ*, 1583, 8vo. See Walchii, Bibl. Theol., i. 270; ii., 451.

——— **Majerhoferus** (Mat.) Disputatio de III. Peccatorum generibus, mortali, veniali et originis. 4to. *Ingolst.*

——— **Spindlerus** (Sebast.) Sendbrieff eines alten verlebten Theologi, an einen audern Prædicanten seinen Nachbar vom Streit über die erbsünde. 8vo. *Braunschweig.*

——— **Beza** (Theol.) The Treasure of Truth touching the grounde worke of Man his salvation, and chiefest pointe of Christian Religion. Turned from Latin into English by J. Stockwood. *Lond.*

Herbert in his edition of Ames's Typographical Antiquities, notices a former edition entitled Treatise of Truth, translated by Whittingham, *Geneva*, about 1556.

——— **Hamilton** (Archibald, Calvinianæ Confusionis demonstratio, contra maledicam ministrorum Scotiæ responsionem. sm. 8vo. *Paris.*

——— **Schnepflus** (Erb.) Disputatio; an peccatum recte dici possit substantia. 4to. *Tub.*

——— **Weller** (H.) Libellus de oratione ad Deum de fide; de libero arbitrio. pp. 200. 12mo. *Lips.*

Of the greatest rarity. Not in Brit. Mus.

——— **Irenæus** (Christ.) Wächter Hörnlein. 4to.

——— Widerlegung des Examinis Christ Irenæi, so er wider den ersten artickul des concordien-Buchs von der Erbsünde ausgeben lassen. fol. *Heydelb.*

Another Ed., same place, 1582.

——— **Marbachius** (Joh.) Matthæi Tractatus de Peccato originali, continens Papistarum et potissimum Flacianorum Refutationem. 8vo. *Francof.*

Also Author of the following "Flacianismus à primario Theologo D. Geor. Mullero, Jenensi, adumbratus."—*Ursel.* "De Candore et Fide D. Matth. Chemnitii et Dan. Hoffmanni in capite de Peccato originali adhibita."—*Ursel.* 8vo; and "Epistola gravissima qua Illyricus absolvitur adjunctis aliis Epistolis."—*Ursel*, 8vo; and "Themata de Imagine Dei," *Argent.*, 1568, 4to.

1581. **Melissander** (Casp.) Klarer Bericht von der Sünde ob sie ein Substans, oder Accidens sey, &c. 4to. *Witteb.*

1582. **Pappus** (Joh.) De Libero Arbitrio. *Argent.*

——— **Hero** (Albertus) De Providentia Dei, libri quinque. 8vo. *Co'oniæ.*

——— **Beza** (Theod.) Tract. de Doctrina et Usu Prædestinationis. 8vo. *Genev.*

——— **Celichius** (Andr.) Doctrina de Peccato Originis orthodoxis quæstionibus illustrata. 4to. *Güstrov.*

Very rare. Lipenius Bibl. Real. Theol. ii., 458, gives the date as 1581. Another Ed., *Lips.*, 1596, 4to.

——— **Mosellanus** (Joh.) Pia et succincta responsio ad præcipua Argumenta Spangenbergii. 4to. *Tubing.*

1583. **Ward** (Roger) A Sermon on Predestination. *Lond.*

——— **Sturmius** (Hub.) Diatribe de æterna et immutabili Prædestinatione Dei. 8vo. *Lugd. Bat.*

Other Ed. *Servestæ*, 1597, 8vo; *Hanov.*, 1604, 8vo. The Author was a Calvinist. No Ed. in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Prime** (John) Treatise of Nature and Grace. 8vo. *Lond.*

Not in Brit. Mus.

——— **Chytræus** (Dav.) Oratio de Statu Ecclesiarum in Græciâ, &c. 8vo. *Francof.*

See pp. 17 and 18, Freewill.

——— **Kyspenning** (Hen.) Aqua Vitæ de Fontibus Salvatoris hoc est, Doctrina evangelica de Meditatione Mortis Addita est Immortalitatis Animæ..... Assertio. 8vo. *Antv.*

——— **Valentia** (Gregory de) Disputatio de officio proprio Christi Redemptoris et Mediatoris, in inclyta atque Catholica Ingolstadiensium Academia die... Februarii anno 1583 publice proposita. Præside Gregorio de Valentia, S.J. pp. 55. 4to. *Ingolst.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Gorscius** (Jac.) Prælectionum Plocensium liber quintus; sive de lapsu et restauratione, justificationeque hominis. 8vo. *Colon.*

Another Ed. same place, 1584.

——— Refutatio Irenæi. fol. *Heildelb.*

——— **Clodinus** (Matthias) Liber de modo acquirendæ Divinæ gratiæ ..per M. C....in Latinum...versus, etc. 4to.

——— **Beza** (Theol.) De Prædestinationis doctrina, ex T. B. Prælect. excerpta, à Ralph. Eglino. 8vo. *Jenæ.*

1583 or 1584. **Harsnet** (James) A Sermon on the subject of Predestination. 16mo. *Lond.*

The Author was successively Bishop of Chichester and Norwich.

1584. **Grynæus** (Joh. Jac.) Disputationes Theologicæ in Academiâ Basiliensi habitæ. *Genev.*

See part ii. There was another Edition published at Basle in 1586. See 1579.

——— **Valentia** (Gregory de) De Scientia Dei et prædestinatione Theses bipartitæ. 4to. *Ingolst.*

Not in the Brit. Mus. Also Author of "Defensio." *Ingolst*, 1584.

——— **Suevus** (Sigism.) Predigten von der Prædestination. 8vo. *Leips.*

A Lutheran.

——— **Kirchnerus** (Sim.) Bericht auff das Wächter-Hörnlein Christ. Irenæi, in welchem er sich unterstehet die irrige Proposition und Rede das nemlich Gott der Sünde oder Erbsünde selbst gnädig sey, zu vertheidigen. 8vo. *Heydelb.*

——— **Steininger** (Gallus) Bericht von der Erbsünde wider die Flacianische Neuerung. 4to. *Friburg.*

——— **Andreæ** (Jac.) Disputatio de Peccato Originali. 4to. *Tubing.*

——— **Marbachius** (Philip) Refutatio examinis Christ. Irenæi, quod adversus primum Caput libri Christianæ concordiæ de peccato originis edidit. 4to. *Francof.*

1585. **Andreæ** (Jac.) Send-Brieff an Mathiam Flacium von der Erbsünde darinn der ganze handel deutlich erkläret wird. 4to. *Tubing.*

——— **Grynæus** (Joh. Jac.) Censura Theologica de primo generis humani, &c. 8vo. *Heideb.*

——— **Prætorius** (Andr.) Ehrendanck oder Kleinod der iii. höchsten Schäke. 4to. *Franck.*

Another Ed., *Hamb.*, 1609.

——— **Lipsius** (Justus) Electionum libri duo, &c. *Antv.*

A celebrated Prof. of Lovaine. He fluctuated between the Protestants and Romanists, but finally became a bigoted Romanist. He originally favoured the Scholastic system, which he abandoned for the cultivation of Classical literature, particularly the works of Cicero and Seneca, becoming an able expositor of the Stoic system. He was one of the first to bring about a revival of Stoicism, but failed, as he admitted himself, in being a true Stoic, wanting both constancy and consistency. He d. 1606.

——— **Gorrutius** (Andr.) De Providentia Divina et ejus effectus. 8vo.

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— Historia Disputationis. 4to. *Berolini.*

On Original Sin.

1585. **Briegerus** (Jul.) Flores Calvinistici decerpti ex vita Roberti Dudlei, comitis Lecestriæ, Joannis Calvini, Thomæ Cranmeri, Joannis Knoxii, aliorumque Protectorum et Apostolorum Sectæ Zwinglianæ et Calvinianæ.
pp. 86. 8vo. *Neapoli.*
A curious, rare, and valuable volume, full of the most atrocious calumnies against the Protestant Reformers.
There are three copies in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Hunnius** (Ægid.) Die erklærung von der erbsünde. 4to. *Franck.*

——— **Olevianus** (Gaspar.) De Substantia Fœderis Gratuiti inter Deum et Electos, &c. 8vo. *Genev.*
Another Ed. same place 1593.

——— **Gediccius** (Paul.) Refutatio Irenæi oder gründlicher Bericht auff das Examen Christ. Irenæi, etc.
fol. *Heydelb.*

1586. **Bossemius** (Matthias) De clericorum cum fœminis cohabitione, licitane ea sit an non, Tractatus ethicus, &c.
8vo. *Duaci.*
De speciali Dei auxilio.

——— **Otton** (Anton.) Bericht wider das faule stinkende Scheidenwasser derer accidenten die verderbte natur von dei Erbsünde zuscheiden. 8vo. *Eisleb.*

——— **Schernhagen** (G.) Disputatio de prædestinatione. 4to. *Tub.*

——— **Hoffmannus** (Dan.) Disputatio de Peccato originis. 4to. *Helmst.*

——— **Perkins** (Will.) A Treatise touching unto a declaration whether a man be in the state of damnation or in the estate of grace.
Several Ed., *Lond.*, 1589, 1591, 8vo; 1595, 4to; 1608, 16mo.
The Author was a Supralapsarian, and his works were highly esteemed by extreme Calvinists. See 1589.

——— **Pelargus** (Joh.) De originali hominis Justitia, Disputatio Theologica.
4to. *Diling.*

——— **Hunnius** (Ægid.) Gründliche Abfertigung des unverhofften kurzen gegenberichts M. Spangenbergii wie auch des Buchleins welches er unter den Namen Canaidi Sylvestri, wider die Christliche Erklärung ausgesprenget hat.
4to. *Franck.*

1587. **Plateanus** (Pet.) De Vocatione seu de ea vivendi ratione ad quam quisque vocatus est. 8vo.
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Bullinger** (Hen.) Decades. 4to.
1st. Engl. Ed. seems to have been 1577, *Lond.*, 4to.
Of God's providence and of predestination. So highly esteemed by the Reformers, that Archp. Whitgift in full convocation, 1586, procured an order to be made that every minister of a certain standing should procure a copy, read one of the sermons contained in them every week, and make notes of the principal matter contained in the course of reading. He died 1577.

1587. **Mairhofer** (Mathias) De tribus peccatorum generibus mortali veniali et originis theologica disputatio, adversus sæculi hujus sectarios.
4to. p. 39. *Ingolst.*
Mairhofer was a Jesuit Prof. of Philosophy and Theology at Dilingen, and died in 1641.

[1587.] **Bobadilla** (Joh.) MS. De Prædestinatione, liber unus, and Dialogus de Prædestinatione.—In Italian.
As to which see De Backer, vii. 115 and v. 38.

——— **Kirchnerus** (Sim.) Bericht von der erbsünde. 4to. *Jenæ.*

——— **Hunnius** (Ægid.) Disp. de Prædestinatione Salvandorum et huic opposita Reprobatione damnandorum.
4to. *Marp.*

——— **Tossanus** (Dan.) Theses apologeticæ de ea Parte Prædestinationis quam Reprobationem vocant. 4to. *Heidelb.*
The Author took the Calvinist view.

——— **Wigandus** (J.) De Schwenkfeldianismo. dogmata et argumenta cum succinctis solutionibus collecta.
4to. *Lipz.*
Treats of Origin. Sin.
Not in the British Museum.

——— **Spangenberg** (C.) Niederlago der falsch genannten warhafftigen ablehnung Conr. Camerarii. 4to. *Ursel.*

1588. **Matthæus** (J.) De Peccato originali, continens Papistarum et Flacianorum refutationem, et Oratio de Locis Communibus Melancthonis.
Francof. et Witteb.

1588—96. **Bonaventura** (St.) Opera, 7 vols. fol. *Romæ.*
Vol. VI. p. i. p. 5, Breviloquium.—De Gratia Spiritus Sancti, p. 277. De resurrectione a peccato ad gratiam.
This Ed. not in the Brit. Mus.
Another Ed., *Mogunt.*, 1609, 7 vols, fol.; *Lugd.*, 1668, 7 vols. fol.; *Venet.*, 1751—56, 13 tom. 4to; *Paris*, 1864—71, 15 tom. 8vo.
The Author was made Cardinal and Bishop of Albano by Gregory X., and d. 1274. He endeavoured to reconcile the views of Aristotle and the Alexandrians.

——— **Delphinus** (Joan. Anton.) De Divina Providentia. *Romæ.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.
See Arpe, *Theat. Fati.*, 65.

[1588.] **Baro** (Pet., *D.D.*) A speciall Treatise of God's Providence, Englished by J. L[udham]. 8vo. *Lond.*
The Author was Lady Margaret Prof. Camb. in 1574. See ante., pp. 61 and 62.

1588. **Wigandus** (Jo.) De Manichæismo renovato. 4to. *Lips. et Jenæ.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Goclenius** (Rodolph.) Oratio de nativa et hæreditaria in vobis labe et corruptione; seu oratio elenctica de peccato originis, &c. 4to. *Marp.*
Also Author of "An Dei Unitas, Bonitas, &c., ex lumine Naturæ possit cognosci."

1588. **Gianninius** (Thos.) De Providentia ex Sententia Platonis,&c. 4to. *Patav.*

——— **Viperanus** (Joh. Ant.) De Divina Providentia. *Romæ.*

——— **Weberus** (Christ.) Disputatio de Cohærentia liberi arbitrii et Contigentia rerum cum scientia et Prædestinatione divina. 4to. *Mogunt.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Molina** (Lud.) Concordia liberi Arbitrii cum gratiæ donis, Divina præscientia, providentia, prædestinatione et reprobatione, etc.

4to. pp. 512. *Olyssipone.*

Other Editions, *Conchæ*, 1592; *Lugd.*, 1593; and 1622, fol., *Venet.*, 1594 and 1602; *Antv.*, 1595, 1609 and 1715, 4to; *Lips.*, 1723, 4to; *Paris*, 1876, 8vo. An appendix was published in 1689, 4to, pp. 44. The 1st Edition of the work is very scarce. Opera Omnia, *Colon.*, 1613, 6 vols, fol., and it originated the great theological dispute, De Gratia, which separatsd the Dominicans from the Jesuits. Walch says "Liber hic in historia controversiæ Jansenianæ memorabilis est. In eo enim Molina viribus hominis nataralis plus quam deo ejusque gratiæ, tribuit seque a Pelagii errore haud alienum esse, prodidit. Quum Jansenius in *Augustino* eum oppugnasset Jesuitæ dogmata, a Molina proposita, contra Jansenium defendere enisi sunt hancque ob causam adpellati *molinistæ* ac locum sibi fecerunt inter recentiores pelagianos."—*Walch*, ii., 951, 985.

——— **Fabrus** (Pet.) Dodecameron, seu de Dei nomine atque attributo.

8vo. *Paris.*

Another Ed., *Lugd.*, 1592, 8vo.

——— **Gorrœus** (Anton.) Tabula Divinor. opp. in qua de humani generis creatione et restauratione, etc.

8vo. *Lond.*

On same subject Cellarius (Mart.) De operibus Dei, *Argent*, 1643, 8vo; and Nierembergius (J. E.) De ratione divinorum opp., *Antv.*, 1641, 8vo.

——— **Eberhardus** (Georg.) De Voluntate Dei. *Diling.*

1589. **Boethius** (Hen.) *Resp.* Disputatio ...de peccato originis. 8vo.

——— Antwort auff derer Flacianisten Lügen wider Lutheri hanz-Postill.

4to. *Witteb.*

——— **Hoffmannus** (D.)Disputationes 5; de peccato originis quod non sit substantia. *Helmst.*

——— **Rennecherus** (Herm.) Aurea Salutis Catena continens et explicans omnes causas et singula Dei beneficia, ex æterna Electione ad nos per christum descendentia. 8vo. *Herbor.*

Another Ed., *Lichæ*, 1597, 8vo. Also Author of "Scriptum apologeticum de gratuita Electione," *Hanov.*, 1590 8vo; and "Modesta disputatio de Electione," *Hanov.*, 8vo. The Author was a Calvinist.

——— **Junius** (Fr.) Πρωτόκτισα, seu creationis a deo factæ, et in ea prioris Adami ex creatione integri et ex lapsu corrupti historia.

pp. 224., 4to. *Heidelb.*

Rare.

1589. **Spangenbergius** (C.) Anti-Gallus. 8vo.

(Original sin).

——— **Perkins** (Will.) Armilla Aurea.

8vo. *Cantab.*

Another Ed., 1590; *Bas.*, 1596, 8vo. An Engl. transl., *Camb.*, 1591, 8vo; 1592. In this work the Author treats of Predestination, as also in his "Exposition of the Symbole of the Creede,"—in the latter place at large. The late Mr. J. Crossley of Manchester, was of opinion that for solid theological erudition, Perkins' treatises were unrivalled. They certainly were, at one time, highly esteemed.

1590. **Hunnius** (Ægid.) Disputatio de satisfactione Christi pro omnibus singulorum hominum peccatis. 4to. *Marp.*

——— **Baro** (Pet.) Theses publicæ in Scholis peroratæ et disputatæ.

8vo. *Lond.*

These Theses, being only two, were translated into English by John Ludham, under these titles, First—"God's purpose and decree taketh not away the liberty of man's corrupt will." The second "Our conjunction with Christ is altogether spiritual."

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Ludham** (John) A Special Treatise of God's Providence. 8vo. *Lond.*

2nd Ed., *Lond*, 1668, 8vo. The first Ed. is stated in Dr. Kippis's Biog. Brit. to be 1560, 8vo; but I have not been able to find any such edition.

——— **Beza** (Theod.) An Excellent Treatise of comforting such as are troubled about their Predestination.

8vo.

——— **Huber** (Sam.) Beweisung dass die Heidelbergischen theologen ihre gräuliche lehre wieder das leiden Christi verdecken und verbergen, etc.

4to. *Tub.*

——— **Perlitius** (Andr.) Spiegel der gnädigen Wahl und vorsehung-Gottes.

8vo. *Magdeb.*

——— **Huber** (Sam.) Gründlicher Beweis dass Jesus Christus gestorben sey fur die Sünde der ganzen welt. 4to. *Witteb.*

——— **Palaccius** (Joh.) Disputatio de Deo quâ is ex creaturis cognoscitur.

4to. *Deling.*

——— **Snecanus** (Gellius) A Treatise on Predestination.

This is mentioned by Brandt in his Hist. of the Reformation, Bk. XV. The Author was a Minister in Friesland, and took the view of Melancthon. Beza calls him a learned person; but in writing to some of the ministers of Holland expresses his dislike to the above work.

1591. **Vincentius** (Joh.) Relectio de Habituali Gratia. 4to. *Romæ.*

Another Ed., *Neapol.*, 1625. Neither Ed. in Brit. Mus.

——— **Bellarmine** (Cardinal R.) De Controversiis—De gratia generi humano in primo parente collata—De omissione

gratiæ, et statu peccati—De Gratia et libero Arbitrio. *Ingolstadt.*
Not apparently in Brit Mus.
This appears in the 4 vols of his "Disputationes de Controversiis fidei adversus hujus temporis hæreticos," 4 vols, *Paris*, 1608, fol.; *Venet.*, 1721, 5 vols, fol.

1591. **Legate** or **Legatt** (John) Series Causarum Salutis et Damnationis. 8vo. *Cantab.*

——— **Peacham** (Henry) A Sermon upon the three last verses of the 1st Chapter of Job, tending to the consideration of God's Providence, Planting of Patience and applying of Consolation. 16mo. *Lond.*
? an Ed. in 1590.

——— **Avila** (Jo. Roa de) De providentia dei et prædestinatione. fol. *Madrit.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Spina** (J. de) De providentia Dei. *Genev.*
Other eds., *Genev.*, 1598, 8vo; *Norimb.*, 1600, 8vo; In German, *Hanov.*, 1603, 4to.
No Ed. in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Danæus** (Lamb.) Isagoges Christianæ pars quarta, quæ est de salutaribus Dei donis erga Ecclesiam, in qua de bonis ecclesiasticis, de electione Dei, &c. 8vo. *Genev.*
The 1st Ed. seems to have been [*Genevæ*], 1588, 8vo.

——— **Hunnius** (Ægid.) Artickel von der Vorsehung gottes und ewig. Wahl. 8vo. *Franckf.*
In Latin, *Francof.*, 1603, 8vo.

——— **Rungius** (Dan.) Disp. Mang. sub Proef. Æg. Hunnii de æterna Dei Prædestinatione. 4to. *Witteb.*
He also wrote "Disp. de Deo et Dei Attributis," &c., *Witteb.*, 1610, 8vo; and "Examen controversiæ de Imagine Dei in Homine," *Witteb.*, 1603, 4to. Written against Bellarmine.

——— [**Smalcius** (Valent.)] De peccato et peccatorum remissione. 4to. *S. L.*

——— **Hovæus** (R.) De reconciliatione hominis cum Deo, seu de humani generis redemptione, tractatio theolog. 4to. *Basil.*

1592. **Assum** (Joh.) Menshen-Spiegel vor und nach dem Fall. 24mo. *Jrf.*
Another Ed., *Leipz.*, 1621, 8vo.

——— **Mullerus** (Geo.) Predigt. de Prædestinatione. 4to. *Witteb.*
Also Author of "Christl. Predigt. von der Gottl. Fursehung und ewigen Gnadenwahl." *Langingen* [1592], 4to.

——— **Irenæus** (Chr.) Evangelischer und Trostreicher Gnaden Spiegel, zu Trost der betrübten Gewissen. 4to. *Ursel.*

——— **Kimedoncius** (Jac.) De Redemptione generis humani, libri 3; cum uno libro de Prædestinatione. 8vo. *Heidelb.*
Translated into Engl. by Hugh Ince, *Lond.*, 1598, 4to: 1628, 4to. The work is against Huber.

1592—3. **Hunnius** (Ægid.) Expositio Pauli ad Romanos. 2 vols. 8vo. *Francof.*
Treats of Predestination.

1592. **Crusius** (Paul) Collatio de Formis loquendi usitatis in descriptione peccati originalis. 8vo. *Argent.*

——— **Schaffmannus** (Andr.) Controversia de Peccatorum causis contra Piscatorem. 8vo. *Francof.*

——— **Puccius** (Franc.) Assertio Catholica de Christi Servatoris efficacitate in omnibus et singulis hominibus. 8vo. *Goudæ.*
See Bayle, Art. Puccius.

——— **Beza** (Theod.) Apologia de Justificatione per unius Christi, vera fide adprehensi, Justitiam imputatam. 8vo. *Genev.*
Not in Brit. Mus.

——— **Junius** (Franc.) Catholicæ doctrinæ de Natura hominis jacentis in peccato et gratia Dei ex peccato evocantis omnes communiter, et suos excitantis singulariter, &c. 8vo. *Lugd.-Bat.*
This is in vol. 2 of his Opera Theologica, *Genev.*, 1613, fol. The Author is styled by Bp. Hall, "the glory of Leyden—the oracle of textual and School Divinity—subtle in distinguishing, in argument invincible." Previous to his instalment at Leyden he had been Prof. of Divinity in the Univ. of Heidelberg. He d. 1602. Another Ed. of above work, *Lugd. Bat.*, 1593, 8vo.

——— **Hill** (Robt., D.D.) A Golden Chaine; or Description of Theologie, containing the order of the causes of salvation and damnation. 8vo. *Camb.*

——— **Tossanus** (Dan.) Des Schwindel-Geistes eigentliche Merckzeichen in dem unzüchtgen Mann Sam. Hubero der sich wider den ewigen und gerechten Rath Gottes zu einem fürsprecher der Verworffenen und Verdamten auffgeworffen hat. 4to. *Newstadt.*

——— **Eiselin** (Michel.) Disputatio Theologica de Divina Gratia, pp. 36, 4to. *Ingolst.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Huberus** (Sam.) Theses Christum Jesum esse mortuum pro peccatis totius generis humani. 4to. *Tub.*
Same year, *Ursell*, 8vo, "Explicatio, cap. ix, x et xi Epistolæ ad Roman."

——— **Hanfeld** (Geo.) Wegweiser von der Lehre der ewigen Vorsehung und Krafft des opffers Christi. 8vo. *Heydelb.*

——— **Domaninus** (Lactant.) De Divina Providentia. fol. *Morsst.*
No Ed. in Brit. Mus.
Another Ed., *Bernæ et Veronæ*, 1596, 8vo. The Author also wrote on Free Will—Divine Grace. Predestination and Reprobation; see Arpe, Theat. Fati, 66.

1593. **Irenæus** (Christ.) Erklärung was für ein unterschied zwischen Gottes und des Teufels Werck im Menschen. 4to

1593. **Rudius** (Jac.) Libri 2, viz, de Divina Gratiâ et de antichristo. 4to. *Venet.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Osiander** (Luc.) Responsum ad S. Valentianum. Defensio Responsi contra Gregorii apoleg. cui tit. fecit "Peccata," et apologia contra Gregorii "Secunda Peccata." 4to. *Tub.*

——— **Huber** (Sam.) Entdeckung des calvinischen geistes, welcher sich unterstehet, das leiden christi fur unsere sünde zu verlæugnen und auszuheben. 4to. *Witteb.*

——— ——— Drey figuren, welche umzeigen, wie die calvinische lehre zu christi verlæugnung und endlicher verzweifelung angerichtet sey. 4to. *Witteb.*

——— ——— Gegensats der Lutherischen und Calvineschen lehre in etlichen fürnehmen streitigen artickeln. 4to. *Witteb.*

——— ——— Disputatio de fine ad quem homo conditus est, habenda præside, S. H. 4to. *Witteb.*

——— **Fabricius** (Joh.) Predigt von der ewigen Gnaden—Wahl der Menschen zum ewigen leben. 8vo. *Witteb.*

——— Pommerischer Kirchen Bekäntniss von denen artickeln Christlicher lehre, auch von der Anerkinnung gottes. 8vo. *Stett.*

——— **Arcularius** (Dan.) Theses in Cap. IX at Rom. 8vo. *Marp.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

Also Author of "Disp. xiii. de Prædestinatione," and also "Disp. iii., Quest. de Electione," *Marp.*

——— **Mylius** (Geo.) Disp. IV. Prædestin. pro Defensione Articuli IV in Visit. Misnica. contra Tossanum. 4to. *Jenæ.*

Lutheran.

——— **Arius-Montanus** (Bened.) Liber de Generat. et Regenerat. Adami, seu de Historia Generis humani. 4to. *Antv.*

1594. **Gennadius** (Patriarcha Constantin.) De Prædestinatione. A Davidi Hœschelio nunc primum (græce) Editus. 4to. *Aug. Vind.*

Another Ed., *Aug. Vind.*, 1596, 4to; ed. by Libertinus (Car.) *Wratisl.*, 1681, 4to, pp. 64 and 67; and *Pragæ*, 1771, 4to. Wharton in his append. to Cave Ed. 1693, p. 94, gives the date of the first Ed. as 1593, see 1618.

——— **Feu-Ardentius** (Franc.) Dialogi 7, contra Calvinianorum Errores. 8vo. *Col.-Agr.*

——— **Fontana** (M. Publius.) Formica seu de Divina Providentia. *Bergomi.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— Controversiæ inter theologos Witembergenses de regeneratione et electione explicatio. 4to. *Francof., et Witteb.*

Against Huber. The theologians referred to in the title are Hunnius, Lyser, and Gesner. See Walch ii, 646.

1594. **Mamphrasius** (Wolfg.) Warnungs Predigten, I. Von der Göttlichen Vorsehung—II. Von der Verslückung der Gottlosen—III. Von der Gewissheit unserer Gnadenwahl. 4to. *Leipz.*

——— **Vinarius** (Abel.) Examen Jac, Kimedontii de Prædestinatione adv. Huberum. 8vo.

——— **Hunnius** (Ægid.) Tract. de Prædestinatione et Libero Arbitrio. 4to. *Witteb.*

Also author of "Tractatus de Libero Arbitrio cum refutatione Pontificiorum Synergistarum Pelagianorum, &c., circa hunc Articulum Opinionibus." *Francof.*, 8vo; *Tub.*, 8vo.

——— **Osiander** (Luc.) Sententia de Prædestinatione. 4to. *Tub.*

Lutheran.

——— **Hunnius** (Ægid.) Von der Erbsünde gründliche Erklärung. 4to. *Marp.*

Also "Grundliche Abfertigung Cyr. Spangenbergs und auderer, &c." *Franckf.*

——— **Chemnitius** (Mart.) Judicium de Controversia Pelagiana et Synergistica, per Polyc. Lyserum. *Witteb.*

Et per Behmium, *Regiom.*, 1647, 4to.

1595. **Kiening** (Matth.) Bericht von der Göttlichen Prædestination und Reprobation, &c. 4to. *Mäyntz.*

——— **Reinhold** (Joh.) Predigt. von der ewigen Vorsehung Gottes. 8vo. *Erfurt.*

——— **Frederus** (Joh.) Theses de Prædestinatione. 4to. *Witteb.*

——— **Junius** (Franc.) De Peccato primo Adami, et Genere Causæ qua ad Peccandum adductus est, Liber. 8vo. *Lugd. Bat.*

Reprinted *Lugd. Bat.*, 1596, 8vo; 1604, 4to, and 1614; and in vol 2 of Opera, *Gen.*, 1613, fol.

——— **Hemmingius** (Nicol.) Brevis Refutatio Doctrinæ de Universali Gratia. 12mo. *Hafn.*

——— [**Hubbocke**(William)] An Apologie of Infants, In a Sermon proving by the revealed Will of God that Children prevented by death of theire Baptisme by God's Election may be saued. By W. H. Preached in the Tower of London. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Perkins** (Will.) An Exposition of the Symbole or Creed of the Apostles. 8vo. *Camb.*

In this work of the celebrated Calvinist, he treats of God's Providence, Adam's fall and original sin, the Covenant of grace and Predestination.

[1595]. **Greenham** (Rich.) Certa Elect. Signa. *Lond.*

His collected works by Hen. Holland, 1599, 4to; 2nd Ed. same year; 1601, fol.; with additions, 1605, 1612, 1681, fol. The Author was a Puritan Divine, Fell. of Pembroke Hall, Camb., Rector of Dry Drayton. See Brook's Lives of the Puritans.

——— **Binsfeldius** (Pet.) Receptæ Sententiæ de Statu Innocentiæ, Peccato Originis, Libero Arbitrio, &c. 8vo. *Aug. Trev.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Huber** (Sam.) Confutatio brevis libri sub alieno Nomine editi de Controversia inter Theologos Vitembergenses et Sam. Huberum. 4to. *Witteb.*

——— ——— Bestændiges, bekænntnis von seiner Lehr. 4to. *Ursel.*

(General Particular Election). Another Ed., *Ursel.*, 1598, 4to.

——— **Lanterbach** (Sam.) Huberi confutatio. 4to. *Muhll.*

——— Bescheidentliche antwort auff das (kurtze) deutsche bekænntnis D. Sam. Hubers von der ewigen prædestination, &c. 4to. *Witteb.*

——— Facultatis theologicæ Rostochiensis. Epistola ad theologos Vitembergenses de electione ad vitam æternam. *Witteb.*

(Against Huber).

——— **Piscator** (Jo.) Disputatio theologica de prædestinatione. 8vo. *Herbonæ.*

Twisse very truly says of him, he was an excellent Scripture divine, but no school divine. He was Prof. of Divinity at Herborn. b. 1546, d. 1626. He was originally a Lutheran, then a Calvinist.

——— **Langen** (Abr.) Pred. von der Auserwählten ewigen Gnaden-Wahl, und der Gottlos. Verdämnis. *Leip.*

——— **Piscator** (Pet.) Disp. de æterna Salvandorum Electione. 4to. *Francof.*

Another Ed., *Jenæ*, 1609, 4to. The Author was a Prof. at Jena.

——— **Huber** (Sam.) Erinnerung von Gegenwärtigen Zwietracht über die Lehre von der Gnaden-wahl. 4to. *Mülhausen.*

——— ——— Warnung wider D. Lucæ Osiandri Predigt von der Gnadenwahl an das herzogthum Wurtenberg. 4to. *Ursel.*

——— **Tossanus** (Dan.) de Pelagianismo. 4to. *Heidelb.*

1596. **Leonitius** (Joh.) Confirmatio derer Würtenbergischen Theologen reiner Biblischer und *Formulæ Concordien*—Buche von der Gnaden-Wahl wider hubern, &c. 4to.

——— **Spindlerus** (Geo.) Lehre vom Gnadenbund Gottes durch Christum, mit allen Auserwehlten aufgerichtet. 8vo. *Amberg.*

Also Author of "Bericht von der Gnaden-Wahl," *Herborn*, 8vo.

1596. **Snecanus** (Gellius) Isagoge in 9th cap. Epistolæ ad Romanos. 8vo. *Harlemmi.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

Also author of "De Fœdere Dei," &c., *Lugd. Bat.*, 1584, and "De Cognitione dei et hominis, triplici in hoc Vitæ Statu," *Herb.*, 1591, 8vo.

On this subject appeared in addition to other works mentioned in this list the following—Havemanni (Mich.) *Theognosia* antiquissima. *Bremæ*, 12mo. Konig (Joh. Frid.) *Resp.* And. Westphal., *Theognosia* ex John XVII, v. 3., *Gryhis.*, 1650, 4to; Lucius (N.) De Deo et Attributis Dei, quatenus Lumine naturali cognosci possint; Matthius (Christ.) De notitia Dei naturali, ejus essentia, usu et efficacia contra Photinianos, *Norimb.*, 1629, 4to; Menochii (Joh.) *Theognosia*, sive Dei Cognitio ex Lumine Naturæ, *Francof.*, 1629; Morini (Joh.) De vera Cognitione Dei, *Par.*, 1657, 12mo; Muller (And.) De Cognitione Dei et hominis, *Colon*, *Brand.*, 1665, 4to; Osiander, (J. A.) Deus in lumine Naturæ, *Tub.*, 1665, 4to; Otto (Jac.) Erkandnitz Gottes und seiner selbst., *Augsp.*, 1679; Pasoris (J.) De Cognitione Dei; Poniatovius (Jul.) Dissertatio., An Angeli et Cælites perfecte Deum in sua Essentia qualis est cognoscant, *Han.*, 1620, 4to; Stock (Rich.) Stirps. Divinæ Cognitionis; Theophili (Christ.) Glaubeus Auge oder Christliche Unterweisung wie ein sterblicher Mensch den Ursterblichen Gott in dieser Welt beschanenkan, *Nurnb.*, 1661, 12mo.

——— **Abraham** (R.) Eloquia pura; (id) est liber Theologicus de Peccato, Pœnitentia, &c. 8vo. *Saloniæ.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Arnobius** (Aser.) Conflictus cum Serapione, de.....Concordia Gratiæ et Liberi arbitrii. *Col.-Agr.*

Other Ed., *Colon. Agr.*, 1618, fol.; *Par.*, 1639, fol. Arnobius was a semi-Pelagian, who flourished about 460. This work will be found in La Bigne Mag. Bibl., vol. 15, 1654, fol.; and in the Bibl. Max. Patr., vol 8, 1677, fol.; p. 203; also Migne, tom. 53, 1844, 4to.

——— **Speroni** (Sperone) Dialoghi. 4to. *Venet.*

Contains—"De Fortuna'—See Arpe Theat. Fati, 66. The author was first Prof. of logic in the Univ. of Padua, and in 1528, Prof. of Philosophy. He was one of the greatest orators of the day, and died at Padua, 1588, aged 88.

——— **Textor** (Bern.) Kern der heil. Bibel. i., von dem ewigen Gnadenbund, ii., von den Mitteln des Gnaden Bundes, iii., von den Früchten desselben. *Herb.*

——— **Pandocheus** (Jo.) Consensus orthodoxus ecclesiæ Lutheranæ in doctrina de prædestinatione. 8vo. *Helmst.*

Also author of "Predigten von der *Prædestination*," *Ursell*, 1597, 8vo.

——— Christlicher Bericht von der Göttlichen Versehung. *Leip.*

——— **Hornstein** (Jac.) Catholischer Beweis, das Gott nicht Zugleich an einem ort wie am andern seine Gutthat erzeige, sondern einen für den andern hiezu erwehle. 8vo. *Ingolst.*

——— **Huber** (Sam.) Entdeckung wieder Osiander von der Gnadenwahl. 4to.

1596. Armilla aurea. 8vo. *Basil.*
(Calvinistic Predestination).

——— **Huber** (Sam.) Nothwendige entdeckung, wie D. Lucas Osiander in der predigt von der gnadenwahl die Calvinische lehre verstecket habe. 4to.

——— Grundliche wiederlegung der von D. Samuel Hubern ausgesprengten schmœhkarten. 4to. *Witteb.*

——— **Lubinus** (Eilhardus) Phosphorus de prima causa et natura mali. 12mo. and 8vo. *Rostoch.*

Another Ed. same place, 1601, 8vo. "In libro hoc novam rationem, mali originem explicandi, monstrare voluit ac statuit, malum ; sive peccatum, esse nihilum atque originem suam referre ad nihilum, tamquam principium."—*Walch* ii, 653. Lubinus supposed there were two co-eternal principles, not *matter* and a *vacuum*, or *void* as Epicurus did, but God and the *Nihilum* or Nothing. *God* he supposed was the good principle, and *Nothing* the evil principle. He added that sin was only a bare tendency towards *nothing* or no Being, and that sin was necessary to make the nature of good better understood. He applied to that *Nothing*, all that Aristotle asserts of the *Materia Prima* or First Matter. Lubinus was opposed by Grawerus Mylius, Hutterus, Piscator, Schlusselburgius, Major, Petræus, and others. See further Bayle Dict, vol. 7, 206.

——— **Hunnius** (Ægid.) Widerlegung D. Hubers Vorrede. 4to. *Franckf.*

——— **Hunnius** (Ægid.) Art. de Providentia et æterna Electione Filiorum Dei ad salutem. *Frankof.*

Other Ed. 1603, same place, and *Witt.*, 1605, 8vo.

——— **Osiander** (Luc.) Pred. von der ewig-Gnadenwahl der Kinder Gottes. 4to. *Tvb.*

[1596]. **Benius** (Paul) De dirimenda Controversia et Libero Arbitrio. *Veronæ.*

1597. **Codomannus** (Sal.) Ob die ungetaufften verstorbenen Kinder selig oder verlohren seyn. 4to. *Leipz.*

——— **Hunnius** (Ægid.) Tract. de Libero Arbitrio. 8vo. *Francof.*

——— ——— Tract. de providentia Dei et æterna prædestinatione. 8vo. *Francof.*

Anticalvinist. Another Ed. same place and size, 1603.

——— **Rollock** (Rob.) Tract. de Vocatione efficaci. 8vo. *Edinb.*

Other Ed., *Herb.*, 1600, 8vo; and 1681, 8vo. Translated into Engl. by H. Holland, *Lond.*, 1603, 4to. In select works, *Edinb.*, 1849, vol. i., 29. The Author was Principal and Professor of Divinity in the Univ. of Edinb. In 1595 he was nominated one of the commissioners for the visitation of Colleges, and in 1597 Moderator of the General Assembly. He died 1598, aged 43. Also author of "Com. in Epist. ad Rom." *Genev.*, 1596.

——— **Reginaldus** (Gul.) Calvino-Turcismus. 8vo. *Ant.*

Rare. Another Ed. *Colon. Agrip.*, 1603, 8vo.

1597—99. **Schlusselburg** (Conr.) Catalogus hæreticorum. 8vo. *Francof.*

Lib. XII. Original Sin, and "Refutatio Synergistarum, seu Novorum Pelagianorum." Another Ed. *Francof.*, 1624, 8vo ; also author of "Theologiæ Calvinistarum," *Francof.*, 1592 and 1594—1610, 4to.

1597. **Hierocles** de Providentia et Fato. 8vo. *Lutet.*

The author was a Platonic philosopher of Alexandria, who flourished about A.D. 450.

Other Ed., *Lond.*, 1654, 8vo; 1673, pp. 271. 12mo.

——— **Heilbrunner** (Jac.) Swenckfeldio-Calvinismus. 8vo. *Francof.*

Written in German.

——— **Hotman** (Jean Sr. D'Infandie) De la Providence Divine. 8vo. *Paris.*

Another Ed. 1691, 8vo.

——— **Sturmius** (H.) De æterna et immutabili prædestinatione Dei, electione atque reprobatione diatribe. pp. 143. 12mo. *Servestæ.*

Of the most extreme rarity.—Never met with but one copy. The above is a 2nd Ed.

No Ed. in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Sluterus** (Sever.) Disput. Logica, ex cap. ix. ad Romanos. 8vo. *Hamb.*

This 1st Ed. very rare.—never met a copy. Another Ed. *Hamb.*, 1607, 8vo.

The Author was a Lutheran.

——— Ministri Genevenses de Peccato Originali. 8vo. *Heidelb.*

——— **Zanchius** (Hier.) De Operibus creationis, et de redemptione. *Neost.*

This Ed. not in Brit. Mus.

——— **Perkins** (Will.) A Reformed Catholicke.

Treats of Free Will and of Original Sin.

——— **Gomarus** (Fr.) Conciliatio doctrinæ orthodoxæ de providentia Dei. 8vo. *Lugd. Bat.*

——— **Nicolaus** (Philip) Kurtzer bericht von der Calvinisten Gott und ihrer religion. 8vo. *Franckf.*

Another Ed., *Lips.*, 1620, 12mo. Also author of a treatise, "De Omniscientia Christi," 8vo.

——— **Snepsius** (Theod.) Disputatio in Ephes. i. 4to. *Helmst.*

——— **Cousin** (Jean.) Fundamenta religionis ; hoc est, de naturali Dei cognitione ..... et de Justitia Dei. 8vo. *Duaci.*

——— Grundlicher Bericht von der ewigen Versehung Gottes, wie die Calvinischen davon lehren. 8vo. *Hanau.*

——— **Huber** (Sam.) Rettung meiner allezeit bestœndigen bekænntnis von der gnadenwahl.

——— ——— Sendbrieff und antwort auf D. Jacob. Heilbrunners sendbrieff, etc. 4to.

Or 1598. See Lipenius, ii. 48.

——— ——— Kurtze anleitung, wie man D. Ægid. Hunnen und D. Luc. Osiandern samt ihren anhang examiniren und dieselbigen in mitten des lengnens in aller calvinisterei erkaschen solle.

1597. **Huber** (Sam.) Invicta veritas de facta in christo prædestinatione universi generis humani ad salutem. 4to. *Ursel.*

——— ——— Expl. c. IX., X., XI., Epist. ad Rom. Contra Particularios. 4to. *Ursel.*

——— **Meehlfuhrerus** (Jo.) Theses huberianismo oppositæ. 4to.

——— **Osiander** (Luc.) Gründlicher bericht auf D. Sam. Hubers læsterschrift, samt der predigt D. Osianders. 4to. *Witteb.*

——— Der Wittebergischen Theol. Facultat Bekäntnus von der ewigen Gnadenwahl und Verordnung Gottes zur Seligkeit an alle A. C. verwandte Chur-und Fürsten sampt allen Ständen und Städten. 4to *Witteb.*

——— **Heilbrunner** (Jacob.) Sendbrieff an D. Sam. Hubern, mit vorgesezter præfatio der theologischen facultæt zu Wittenberg. 4to. *Witteb.*

——— Acta Huberiana. 4to. *Tub.* (Predestination.)

——— **Huber** (Sam.) Historische beschreibung des gantzen streits zwischen D. Hunnen und D. Hubern. 4to.

——— ——— Anleitung wie D. Hunnius und D. Osiander zu examiniren das sie Calvinisch erfunden. 4to.

——— **Schnepffius** (Theod.) Disp. in Eph. i. 4to. *Helmst.*

——— **Victor** (Jerm.) Articul von Gottes Vorsehung, und der ewigen Wahl der Gottes Kind. zur Seligk. 8vo. *Franckf.*

——— **Heilbrunner** (Jac.) Endliche und Schliesliche entschuldigung wider D. Huberi in Druck gesprengte Antwort und Sende-Brieff, etc. 4to. *Witteb.*

——— **Schaffmannus** (Andr.) Controversiarum de Peccatorum causis et Prædestinatione. 8vo. *Francof.*

1598. **Polanus** (Amand.) Didascalia de æterna dei prædestinatione. 8vo. *Basil.*

Other Ed., *Basil*, 1600, 8vo; *Witteb.*, 1613, 4to. A Calvinist.

——— **Perkins** (William) De Prædestinationis modo et ordine et de amplitudine Gratiæ Divinæ ... Christiana disceptatio. 8vo. *Cantab.*

Reprinted *Basil*, 8vo, 1599. This work was transl. into English by Cacot (Francis), *Lond.* 1606, 8vo.

——— **Jacob** (Henry) A Treatise of the Sufferings and Victory of Christ in the work of our Redemption, &c. 8vo. *London.*

Jacob was the founder of the first Independent or Congregational Church in England. He pub. a defence of the above work in 1600, 4to. It was the first answer to Bp. Bilson's sermon of Redemption, preached in 1597, pub. 1598, 8vo.

1598. **Huber** (Sam.) Erklærung, wie gut und redlich D. Polyc. Leiser es getroffen und der verlohrnen sache geholfen habe. 4to. *Ursel.*

——— **Lyser** (Polyc.) Antwort auf das von D. Sam. Hubern augestellte examen. 4to. *Dresd.*

——— ——— Predigten von der ewigen Gnadenwahl. 4to. *Witteb.*

There is a work by Benderus on the same subject, without date, *Witteb.*, 4to; mentioned by Lipenius, Bibl. Real. Theol., i., 585.

——— ——— Erlæuterung uber drey fragen, welche Sam. Huber mit seinem examine erreget hat. 4to. *Dresd.*

——— **Abbot** (George, *D.D.*) Quæstiones sex.....VI. an Deus sit author peccati: totidem prælectionibus in schola theologica Oxoniensi disputatæ, anno 1597. 4to. *Oxon.*

This does not seem to be in the Brit. Mus. Another Ed., *Francof.*, 1616, 4to; published by the famous Abraham Scultetus. Abbot became Dean of Winchester in 1599, and Vice-Chancellor to the Univ. of Oxf., 1600; Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry, 1609, being transl. same year to London, and finally, in 1611, became Archbishop of Canterbury. He was a Calvinist.

——— **Mylius** (And.) Predigt. von der Gnadenwahl. 8vo. *Strasb.*

——— **Rothbart** (Christ.) Predigten von der Prædestination. 8vo. *Hamb.*

——— **Hunnius** (Ægid.) Theses Huberianismo oppositæ de Electione Huberiana. 4to. *Francof.*

——— **Amling** (Wolfang.) Erklärung der Kennzeichen der Auserwehlten gottes. 4to. *Zerbst.*

A Calvinist. The book is not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Vasquez** (Gabr.) Comment. in Primam partem S. Thomæ, vol 1, De Deo, de Prædestinatione, etc. fol. *Compluti.*

This 1st Ed. is not in the Brit Mus., but other Ed. there as, 1608, fol.; 1609, fol.
"Egregius theologus."—*Gener.* The Author was a Jesuit.

——— Libellus de Prædestinatione et gratia Dei. 8vo. *Cantabrigiæ.*

Very rare. A copy in the Biblioth. Heinsiana, p. 92.

——— **Huber** (Sam.) Rettung des Spruchs Rom. VIII. welche Er zuvor verschen die hat er auch verodnet, &c., wider die alten und neuen calvinisten. 4to. *Ranpen.*

——— ——— Bekentnis ob Gott durch seinen lieben John Jesum Christum nur allein etliche wenige Menschen, etc. 4to. *Ursel.*

1598. **Huber** (Sam.) Innhalt und Begriff samt denen Gründen Zwischen D. Hubero und D. Hunnio von der Gnadenwahl. 4to. *Ursel.*

1599. **Osiander** (Luc.) Leztere antwort auf D. Sam. Hubers læsterschrifften. 4to. *Tub.*

——— **Casmannus** (Otho) Beweis und Betrachtungen der Liebe Gottes gegen nus. 8vo. *Francof.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

Also author of "Gnaden-Spiegel der herklichen Liebe und Gnade. Gottes gegen seine Anserwehlten," *Marp.*, 12mo.

——— **Hemmingius** (Nicol.) Antidotum et Tract. de universali Gratia. 8vo. *Rostoch.*

——— **Langenmantl** (Wolfg. Henr.) Theses Theologicæ de Necessitate Gratiæ ad operandum. 4to. *Ingolst.*

——— **[Willet** (Andrew)] A Christian Letter of certaine English Protestants. Pub. Mr. R. Hooker, etc. 4to. *Lond.*

This is one of the earliest books of the doctrinal Puritans. In it Hooker is accused of renouncing the doctrines he had solemnly subscribed to, and with the design of bringing back Popery. He is charged with a wanton attack on Calvin, and condemned on account of unsoundness of doctrine respecting Grace, Free Will and Predestination, and the conditions of the Christian covenant. See Wordsworth's Eccles. Biog., vol. iv., p. 269. The letter was answered by Dr. Covel. The book is not under the author's name in the list of his works in Brit. Mus. Cat.

——— **Lobechius** (Dav.) Synop. de æterna Dei prædestinatione. *Rostoch.*

Another Ed., *Witteb.*, 1610, 4to.

——— **Whitaker** (Will., D.D.) Concio in 1 Thess., v. 12, de Prædestinatione et certitudine salutis. *Cantab.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

The author was a Lancashire man, and Regius Prof. of Divinity at Camb. He is best known for his controversy with Bellarmine, and as the author of the Lambeth Articles.

——— **Polanus** (Amand.) A Treatise concerning God's Eternal Prædestination, translated by Roger Gostwyke. 18mo. *Camb.*

——— **D'Avila** (Fr.) Commentatio de Gratia et libero Arbitrio sive de Auxiliis Divinæ gratiæ ac eorum Efficacia. 4to. *Romæ.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

1599. **Fulgentius** (Dom. Estensis) De Natura Originalis peccati et pœna ejus. 8vo. *Pat.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Morton** (Thos.) A Treatise on the Nature of God. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Carucciolus** (Hippolitus) De Providentia Divina. *Venet.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

See Arpe, Theat. Fati, 69.

——— **Huber** (Sam.) Grundfeste darauff der Glaube bestehen mus. 4to. *Ursel.*

——— **Bilston** (T.) The Effect of certaine Sermons touching the fvll Redemption of Mankind by the death and bloud of Christ Jesus, preached at Paules Crosse and elsewhere. pp. 432, 4to. *Lond.*

Allibone gives the date as 1598, 8vo.

The Sermons were preached by the encouragement of Archbishop Whitgift. They are important as marking an epoch in Elizabethan Theology and greatly alarmed the Puritans, probably from their patristic erudition and eminent readability. They were in fact an answer to a book by Henry Jacob, a learned Puritan, with the title "A Treatise of the sufferings and victory of Christ in the work of our Redemption," &c. In 1600 Jacob responded in "A Defence," and to this Bilston, by the royal command replied in "The Survey of Christ's sufferings for man's redemption: and of his descent to Hades or Hel, for our deliverance," *Lond.*, 1604, fol. The above work was repub. in Tracts of Ang. Fathers, ii., 73. Bilston was Bishop of Worcester in 1596, and in 1597 was translated to Winchester. It is said that if the prose of any one man of the Bible Translators appointed by James I. appears in our authorized version, it is probably that of Bilston.

——— **Suarez** (Francis) Varia Opuscula Theologica. fol. *Matriti.*

Contains 1.—De Concursu, motione, et auxilio Dei, libri III. 2.—De Scientia Dei futurorum contingentium, lib. II. 3.—De Auxilio Efficaci. 4.—De Libertate divinæ voluntatis. Various editions 2nd, *Mogunt.*, 1600, pp. 707, 1610, 1612, fol.; *Lugd.*, 1611, pp. 816, 4to; De Bacher did not know of this Edition. "Opuscula sex inedita," *Brux. et Paris*, 1859, fol.; contains I. "De Auxillio Gratiæ," &c. The 1st Ed. not in the Brit. Mus.

His works, *Mogunt. et Lugd.*, 1599—1651, 22 vols, fol.; *Paris*, 1872—78, 28 vols, 4to.

The Author was a celebrated Jesuit.

1600—1699.

1600. **Balduinus** (Frid.) Disputatio publica de peccato originis. 4to. *Witteb.*

——— **Scribonius** (Car.) Ars Mentiendi Calvinistica cum vero comment. Romani Veronensis. 8vo.

——— **Tossanus** (Dan.) Liber votivus de Providentia et de Sacramentis. 8vo. *Heideb.*

——— **Jacob** (Hen.) A Defence of a Treatise touching the Sufferings and Victorie of Christ in the Work of our Redemption, against Bp. Bilston. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Blessensis** (Peter) Opera emendata, cum variis Lectionibus et notis, per Joh. Busæum. *Mogunt.*
De Præstigiis Fortunæ, lib. II.

——— **Whitaker** (W. D.D.) Tractatus ...de Peccato Originali...editus...cura J. Allenson. 8vo. *Cantab.*
Another Ed., *Hanov.*, 1604, 8vo.
The Author was a learned Calvinist Divine, Regius Pro,. of Divinity at Cambridge, and Chancellor of St. Paul's, 1580, Master of St. John's Coll., Camb., 1586 and d. 1596.

——— **Polanus** (Amand.) Erklœrung etlicher streitigen puncten in religionis artickeln von christo und der ewigen gnadenwahl gottes. 8vo. *Basil.*

——— **Gerlachius** (Steph.) Tres disputationes de electione huberianismo oppositæ. 4to. *Tub.*
The Author was Doct. of Philosophy at Erlingen, 1567, died 1612, in his 66 year.

——— **Lubinus** (Eilh.) Apologeticus quo Alberti Graweri calumniis respondetur. 4to. *Rostoch.*
Another Ed., *Magde.*, 1605, 4to.

——— **Winigerus** (Joh) Gründlicher Bericht, darinnen gehandelt wird von der ewigen Wahl. 4to. *Tub.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.
The Author was a Lutheran.

——— **Gelhorn** (Frid. von) Bericht von der ewigen Gnaden-Wahl Gottes. 8vo. *Lich.*

1600. **Pasqualius** (Raymundus) in Cap. IX. Epist. ad Rom. 8vo. *Barc.*
The Author was a Roman Catholic.

——— **Felbius** (Dan.) Oratio: an peccatum originis sit substantia contra Flaxineum. 8vo. *Hamb.*
Very rare.

——— **Franckius** (Joh.) Facula Augustiniana Mysterium Peccati tam naturæ quam accidentis illustrans. 8vo. *Ursel.*

——— **Rennecherus** (Herm.) Tract. orthodoxus de spirituali hominis lapsi et corrupti regeneratione. 8vo. *Lichæ.*

1601. **Cheisoilm** (Gul.) Examen Confessionis Fidei Calvinianæ, quam Scotis omnibus illustriesCalviniani subscribendam et jurandam proponunt. 8vo. *Avenione.*
Lat. and Eng. A French Version appeared in Paris in 1603, 8vo.
The Author was Bishop of Vaison.

——— **Feu-Ardentius** (Franc.) Examen des Confessions,Prières,Sacraments, et Catechisme des calvinistes. 8vo. *Par.*

——— **Christmannus** (Henr.) Diagraphe Electionis. 4to. *Mulhusii.*
Hoc est, controversi status inter sinceros Augustanæ confessionis Doctores, Calvinianos, Huberum acPelagianos,Semi-Pelagianosque de æterna Filiorum Dei ad Salutem Electione, s. de Prædestinatione Delineatio, una cum assertione de veræ Doctrinæ et adversariorum Refutatione.
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Fettius** (Dan.)Oratio, an Peccatum Originis sit substantia? 8vo. *Hamb.*

——— **Heilbrunner** (Phil.) Synopsis variorum hujus temporis errorum de peccato originali. 4to. *Laugingæ.*

1602. **Mulhusinus** (Jean) or Spitznaes. Disputatio Theologica; de libero arbitrio, ejusque in divinis rebus ἀδυναμία seu impotentia. pp. 99, 4to. *Mogunt.*

——— Disputatio Theologica de duplici prædestinatione. pp. 108, 4to. *Mog.*

——— Disp. II. (I.) De duplici Prædestinatione (II.) De Libero Arbitrio. 4to. *Mogunt.*

[1602]. **Gesnerus** (Salom.) Disp. II., prosanctissimo libro christianæ concordiæ de Prædestinatione, 4to. *Wittel.*
The Author was a Prof. at Wittemburg.

1602. **Rollock** (Robt.) Tractatus brevis de Providentia Dei, et tractatus de Excommunicatione. 8vo. *Genev.*
Another Ed., *Lond.*, 1604.
In vol 1 of his select Works, pub. *Edinb.*, 1849, 2 vols, 8vo, p. 561, will be found his treatise "De æterna mentis divinæ approbatione et reprobatione."

——— **Theodoret** (Bishop, *of Cyrus*). The Mirror of Divine Providence; containing a Collection of Theodoret his arguments, declaring the Providence of God to appeare notably both in the heavens and in the earth.—Taken out of his workes De Providentia [Edited by J. C.] 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Christmannus** (Henr.) Pars piarum Lucubrationum de sublimi mysterio Electionis æternæ Salvandorum ad Vitam. 8vo. *Lavingæ.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Schmuck** (Vinc.) Predigt über Gen. XXV. 8vo. *Leipz.*
(Proving this chapter does not speak of Predestination.)

——— **Brahe** (Falc.) De Divina Providentia Oratio. 4to. *Bas.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

[1602]. **Pfaffradius** (Casp.) Questio de libero Servoque arbitrio hominis naturali inter Lutherum et Erasmum agitata. 4to. *Helmst.*

1603. **Windeck** (Joannes Paulus) Controversia inter Catholicos et Calvinistas, et efficacia Mortis Christi. *Col. Agr.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Eugubinus** (P. Benius) De Efficaci Dei auxilio, et Libero Arbitrio. 4to. *Patav.*

——— **Andreæ** (Tobias) Erklarung des IX Cap. der Epistel zu den Rom. von der Gnaden-Wahl. 8vo. *Herborn.*
The Author was a Prof. at Groningen. The book is not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Embdenius** (Casp.) Dei Leiter Jacobs, von der wunderbarlichen Regeinung und Erhaltung Gottes, aller Dinge im Himmel und auff Erden. 4to. *Cassel.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

[1603]. **Oxner** (Geor.) Disp. Theologica, De Prædestinatione, et Reprobatione Divina. Præs. Christ. Greutzing, S.J., Resp. G. O. pp. 20. 4to. *Dilingæ.*

——— **Magnus** (J.) *Resp.* Disput. Theol. de libero arbitrio, *Præs.*, Mayle (M.) pp. 22. 4to. *Dil.*
Very rare.

——— **Willet** (Andr.) Libri Rob. Bellarmini de lapsu Adami, &c., refutati. 4to. *Lugd. Bat.*
Very rare.

1604. **Mascareguas** (Ferd. Mart.) Tractatus de Auxiliis Divinæ Gratiæ. 4to. *Lugd.*
Another Ed., *Lugd.*, 1605, 8vo.

1604. De Prædestinatione Liber Apologeticus Magni cujusdam Theologi contra Huberum, Calvinianos et Pontificios. 4to. *Francof.*

——— **Cramerus** (Dan.) Speculum futuræ Gloriæ: accessit de Providentia et æterna Filiorum Dei ad Salutem Electione Liber Apologeticus, Erroribus Huberi, Calvinianorum et Pontificorum oppositus. 4to. *Francof.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Pezelius** (Christ.) Tract. de Prædestinatione. *Lichæ.*

——— **Broughton** (Hugh) Two little Workes defensive of our Redemption. 4to.

——— **Feu-Ardentius** (Fr.) Theomachia Calvinistica, 16 libris profligata, quibus 1400 hujus sectæ novissimæ errores, quorum magna pars nunc primum e suis latebris eruitur, diligenter excutiuntur et refelluntur. 2 vols. fol. *Paris.*
Another ed., *Colon*, 1629, 4to.

——— **Osiander** (Luc.) Enchiridion Controversiarum inter Lutheranos et Calvinianos. 8vo. *Tub.*
Against Calvinism. Frequently reprinted.

——— Tractatus de Prædestinatione. 4to. *Francof.*
Calvinistic.

——— **Becanus** (Martin) Disputatio Theologica an Deus sit auctor peccati contra Calvinistas vel an alius sit Calvinistarum, alius Catholicorum Deus? Præside Martino Becano. 4to. pp. 102. *Moguntiæ.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.
"M. Becanum cujus opera excellunt claritate, quam nemo superabit, quamque ipsis conciliant mira notionum distinctio, accurata status quæstionis definitio, limpidissima argumentorum expositio; eoque gratior est hæc claritas, quod juncta sit brevitate, quæ tamen disputationis solidatæ plenitudini et integritati detrahit nihil," *Hurter, Nomenclator Theol.* The learned Jesuit taught philosophy and divinity at Venice, where he d. 1624. He was most distinguished for his defence of Bellarmine against James I. and Bp. Andrews, but carried the Papal Authority to so extravagant a length that his book was condemned by the Parliament of France, and even by Pope Paul V., 3 January, 1613. See further 1606.

——— **Huber** (Sam.) Erklærung uber die proposition, dass Gott in Christo alle menschen zum leben erwehlet und verordnet habe. 4to. *Hal.*

——— **Lyser** (Polyc.) Abgenöthigter bericht von dem streit mit Sam. Huber, &c. 4to. *Lips.*

——— **Petersdorff** (Christ.) Vatters-Hertz in ii Predigten erkläret. 8vo. *Leipz.*

——— **Lauterbachius** (Erh.) Theses Theol. de Creatione et Providentia Dei. 4to. *Lips.*

1604. Von der ewigen Ansersehung und Gnadenwahl, mit Christoph. Pezelii Vorrede. 4to. *Lich.*

1605. [**Mulhusinus** (Jean) or Spitznaes] Quæstiones Calvinisticæ contra Pareum Moguntiæ ad disputandum propositæ a M. Joanne Bartholomæo Bleidensladiano SS. Theologiæ Baccalaureo Biblico, ad alteriorem gradum consequendum. Præside R. P. Martino Becano. pp. 38. 4to. *Mogunt.*

——— **Battus** (Barth.) Disputat. de æterna prædestinatione. 4to. *Gryph.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Martinz** (Fred.) Tract. de auxiliis Divinæ Gratiæ ad actus supernaturales. *Lug.*

——— **Grawerus** (Alb.) Antithesis doctrinæ Calvinianorum et Christi. *Magdeburgi.*

——— ——— Absurda Calvinianorum dogmata, de Persona Christi, Cœna, Baptismo, et de Prædestinatione contra Panharmoniam Christi et Calvini. *Magdeburgi.*
Another Edition, *Jenæ.*, 1612, 1613, 1656, 4to. Also Author of "Polemica Sacra contra Calvinianos et Photincanos, 1656, which is not in the Brit. Mus. He also wrote a Disputation "De Deo et Dei attributis," in opposition to Vorstius, *Jenæ*, 1613, 4to; and "Dissertatio de novo ac horrendo errore circa doctrinam de satisfactione Christi pro peccatis generis humani," *Francof.*, 1613, 4to.

——— **Arias** (Franc.) Exercitium de Præsentia Dei. 8vo. *Mog.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.
The Author was a Jesuit, writer of several theological Treatises, d. 1605, aged 72. Other Ed., *Herbep.*, 1612, 12mo; *Colon.*, 1607, 1616, 1621, 12mo. The above work appeared in Spain, *Sevilla*, 1596, pp. 893, 4to.

——— **Zanchius** (Hier.) Opera. 8 vols.
Vol. 2—De Natura Dei (see 1577).
Vol. 3—De Provid. Dei. De libero arbitrio.
Vol. 4—De hominis lapsu—De Malo—De peccato originali—De libero arbitrio, &c.
Vol. 7—De perseverantia sanctorum—De Prædestinatione. This Ed. not in Brit. Mus. The one there is [*Hiedelberg*], 1613, 8 tom., fol. Another Edition, S.L., 1619, 8 vols, fol.; and *Gen.*, 1663, fol., 8 vols.

——— **Venator** (Adol. Tect.) Theologicæ Disp. contra Hæreses. 8vo. *Alcmariæ.*

——— **Maccius** (Seb.) De Humanæ Redemptionis Mysterio, Poemata XII libri. 4to. *Rome.*

——— **Mayhew** (Matt.) The Conquests and Triumphs of Grace. 12mo. *Lond.*

——— **Hutterus** (Leon.) ἐξέτασις Theologica de voluntate dei circa æternum prædestinationis salvandorum decretum. 4to. *Witteb.*
Also Author of a Treatise "De Prædestinatione."

1605. **Hoe** (Matt.) Expedita responsio ad adpellationem et provocationem D. Sam. Huberi, cum delineatione articuli de prædestinatione. 4to. *Lips.*

——— **Nicolaus** (Phil.) Responsio ad Huber, compositio de universali electione. *Lips.*

——— **Arminius** (Jac.) Disputationum theologicarum quarto repititarum undecima, de Justitia et efficacia providentiæ Dei in malo, præside J. A. propugnata. 4to. *Lug. Bat.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Paræus** (Dav., *D.D.*) Positiones theologicæ de libero hominis arbitrio præside D. P. 4to. *Heideb.*
Paræus was a Calvinist, and wrote to the Synod of Dort a letter in condemnation of the views of the Arminians. His commentaries on the Romans in 1617 gave so much offence to King James the First, that he had the book burnt by the common hangman. He d. 1622.

——— **Meehlfuhrer** (Joh.) Predigten von der ewigen versehung und Gnadenwahl. 8vo. *Darmst.*

——— **Silberschlag** (Esa.) Predigten von der ewigen Vorsehung und Wahl Gottes. 4to. *Erffurt.*
The Author was a Lutheran.

——— **Martinius** (Matth.) Synopsis de Executione Prædestinationis. 8vo. *Herb.*

——— **Gobelius** (Nic.) Predigten von der *Prædestination* und Ablas. 4to. *Mayn.*

——— Theses Theologicæ in celeb. Acad. Lugd. Bat. propositæ de Natura Dei .. ...de Providentia, de Peccato Originali, de libero Hominis arbitrio..... de Prædestinatione Dei sub præsidiis Jac.-Arminii, F. Gomari, &c. 4to. *Lug. Bat.*

——— **Huber** (Sam.) Erklärung über die Proposition: das Gott in Christo alle Menschen zum Leben erwehlet und verordnet habe. 4to. *Hall in Sachsen.*

1606. **Arnoldus** (Philippus) Disputatio de prædestinatione, etc. 4to.

——— **Osiander** (Andr.) Disputatio de Peccato originis. *Francof.*

——— **Hunnius** (Ægid.) De Peccato originali contra Cyriacum Spangenbergium. 8vo. *Lips.*

——— **Pamlerus** (Casp.) De Peccato Originali. *Lips.*

——— **Ulrich** (Joh. Jac.) Christliche Predigten von der Fursichtigkeit Gottes aus dem III. Capitel der Klaglieder Jerem. 8vo. *Zürch.*

——— **Becanus** (Mart.) Enchiridion variarum disputationum contra Calvinistas de prædestinatione, de authore peccati, justificatione, merito, gratia, etc. Præs. M. B. 8vo. *Mogunt.*
Becanus was a learned Jesuit, zealous in defence

of the Roman Catholic Religion. He died 1624. He was the author of a tract of 25 pp., entitled "De Authore peccati, seu an alius sit Calvinistarum, alius Catholicorum, Deus," which was attacked by David Paræus.—Also of another tract of 41 pp., entitled "De auxiliis gratiæ Christi secundum Calvinistas; vel quam liberalis sit in nos Christus in conferendis donis gratiæ." Also of a tract "De Deo et Attributis Divinis," *Mogunt.*, 1620, 8vo. For a full account of this author's writings, see De Bacher, Bibl. des Ecrivains de la Compaignie de Jesus, vol. 1, pp. 56—60. Replies to his works were numerous; among others G. Vorstius, Crocius, Marx, Hanneken, and Polanus.

1606. **Chamier** (Dan.) Corpus Panstratiæ Catholicæ, sive Controversiarum de Religione adversus Pontificios.
5 vols. fol. *Genevæ.*

See vol. 2, lib. iii., c. 6, vol. 3, lib. ii. and vii.—De Authore peccati.—De homine corrupto, et instaurato, peccato, libero arbitrio, pœnis peccati, prædestinatione.—Chamierus "vastissimæ, qua instructus fuit, eruditionis immortale monumentum, in *Panstratia* sua *Catholica*, ad posteriores transmisit; in qua cum controversiis tractat, quæ Protestantibus cum Romanensibus intercedunt, Rob. Bellarminum præcipue refellens, &c." —*Buddei Isagoge*, pp. 414. 415. "Opus sane est præstantissimum, ac inter reliqua, quæ Reformati dederunt princeps."—*Walch.* Another ed. of above work, *Gen.*, 1626, 5 vols. fol.; *Francof.*, 1627, fol.; *Strasb.*, 1629, fol. The second is the only Ed. in the Brit. Mus.

Chamier was considered by Bayle to be one of the brightest ornaments of the Protestant Church. It is said he had a share in drawing up the Edict of Nantes. He was killed by a canon ball in 1621, during the seige of Montauban, in which town he was a Professor of Divinity.

——— **Thomsonius** (Geo.) Index veritatis contra Lipsium, de Religione, fato et Fraude, etc. 8vo. *Lond.*

Another Ed., *Alcmar*, 1609, 8vo.

1607. **Lubinus** (Eilh.) Tract. theologica de causa peccati ad Theologos Augustanæ confessionis in Germania. *Rostoch.*

The author, according to Monsieur Baillet was better acquainted with polite literature than with divinity.

——— **Grawerus** (Alb.) Anti-Lubinus, sive Elenchus Paradoxorum Lubini, et Emblematum Calvinisticorum etc., de prima causa et naturamali.
4to. *Magdeb.*

This work was a reply to Lubin's "Phosphorus" only, but the author wrote also an answer to Lubin's apology. It was printed by way of appendix to the *Anti-Lubinus*, and entitled "*Responsio ad clumben Lubini Apologeticum.*"

Lipenius dates the above book, 1606, vol. 1, pp. 202, 431.

——— **Casmanus** (Otho) Signo Electionis et Salutis Filiorum Dei.
pp. 542, 8vo. *Francofurti.*

——— **Junius** (Franc.) Opera.
2 vols. fol. *Genevæ.*

Vol I.; another and best Ed., *Gen.*, 1613, 2 vols, fol. See also 1592 and 1595.

——— **Finckius** (Casp.) Schediasmata, seu Controversiæ Theologicæ, Philosophicæ, etc., contra Goclenium, Keckermannum, etc. 8vo. *Giessæ Hass.*

Against Calvinism.

1607. **Hamconius** (Mart.) Certamen Catholicum cum Calvinistis continuo Charactere c. conscriptum. 4to.

Another Ed., *Lovan.*, 1612, 4to.

Every word of this singular poem begins with the letter C.

——— **Suarez** (Francis) Commentaria ac Disputationes in Primam Partem Divi Thomæ, ... De Prædestinatione et Reprobatione, etc. fol. *Mogunt.*

This Ed. not in the Brit. Mus.

Other Ed., *Lugd.*, 1617, fol.; *Mogunt.*, 1620, fol., pp. 537; 1621, fol., pp. 699.

——— **Hunnius** (Ægid.) Articulus de Peccato. 8vo. *Francof. et Witteb.*

——— **Schweizerus** (Joh.) Dissertatio Theologica de Prædestinatione et Reprobatione, etc. 8vo. *Colon.*

——— **Borojus** (Lud.) Dialogismus de divina civium civitatis Dei Prædestinatione, deque civium Sathanæ præscientia et reprobatione. 12mo. *Venet.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

Other Ed., 1638, *Veron.*; 1610, 4to. See 1610.

——— **Maxey** (Anthony) The Goulden Chaine of Man's salvation, and the fearefully point of hardening, together withe the churches sleepe. 3rd. Ed.
8vo. *Lond.*

A 4th Ed., *Lond.*, 1610, 8vo; 5th, *Lond.*, 1614, 4to; 6th, *Lond.*, 1619, 8vo: 7th, *Lond.*, 1634, 8vo.

——— **Vorstius** (Conr.) Tesseradecas anti-Pistoriana. 8vo. *Hanov.*

Treats of Predestination and Reprobation.

——— **Baldvinus** (Frid.) Dispp. X., XI., XII., XIII., pro Visitat. Misnicæ. Art. iv. 4to. *Witteb.*

One on Predestination. Another Ed., *Witteb.*, 1630, 4to; also author of "Com. in Ep. ad Rom." *Witteberge*, 1611, which is not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Piscator** (Pet.) Disputatio de æterna Prædestinatione salvandorum.
4to. *Francof.*

——— **Mentzerus** (Bath.) De Electione Filiorum Dei ad vitam æternam, Tract.
4to. *Giessæ.*

Also author of the following: "Collatio Doctrinæ Zwinglii, Calvini, Bezæ, et Sociorum cum Augustana Confessione Thesibus proposita," *Giessæ*, 1603, 4to. "Defensio collationis Augustanæ confess. cum Doctrina Zwinglianorum et Calvinistarum contra Pierium et Crocium." *Giessæ*, 1618, 4to. "Examen Censuræ Crocianæ de collatione Augustanæ confessionis et Doctrinæ Calvinianæ, etc." *Giessæ*, 1623, 4to. "Disp. de merito Christi." *Giessæ*, 1611, 4to.

——— **Gerhardus** (Joh.) *Resp.* Louigio, Disp. de Providentia. *Coburgi.*

Also author of a treatise "De libero arbitrio."

——— **Pelling** (John) A Sermon [on Pet. v. 7.] of the Providence of God. Preached at St. Paules Crosse, etc.
4to. *Lond.*

——— **Schafer** (Mich.) Acropolis Christianæ Religionis de Unione personali in Christi, etc., de Peccato originis et origine animæ. 8vo. *Tub.*

1608. **Gerhardus** (Joh.) Disputatio de Prædestinatione. 4to. *Coburgi.*

——— **Becanus** (Mart.) Aphorismi doctrinæ Calvinistarum, cum brevi Resp. ad aphorismos falso Jesuitis impositos. 8vo. *Mogunt.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Zanchius** (Hier.) Miscellaneorum. 4to *Neost.*

Vol I., pp. 241.
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Pindar** (Elizabeth) God's Providence is mine Inheritance.

[1608] **Gillius** (Christopher) Tractatus de Prædestinatione.

MS. in the Library of the Jesuit College at Coimbre in Portugal. See De Bacher, ii., 233.

1608. **Weinrichius** (Georg.) Enodatio controversiæ de viribus liberi arbitrii in homine. 4to. *Lips.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Huber** (Sam.) Modus ineundæ concordiæ in controversia de electione ad vitam. 4to.

——— **Muhlmann** (Joh.) Predigten von der Gnadenwahl. 4to. *Leip.*

Also Author of "Liber Vitæ," *Leips.*, 1612, 4to.

——— **Eglinus** (Raph.) Explicatio Divini Propositi de Divina Prædestinatione. 4to. *Marpurgi Cattorum.*

Another Ed., *Amst.*, 1617, 4to. Neither Ed. in the Brit. Mus.
The Author was a Calvinist.

——— **Ravensbergerus** (Henr.) Examen Controversiarum de causa impulsiva Prædestinationis. 8vo. *Herbip.*

The Author was a Roman Catholic.

——— **Draxe** (Thos.) Com. in XI. Chap. to Romans.

Not in the Brit. Mus.

1609. **F. Gomari** verclaringhe der hooftpuncten, ghehandelt in de laetste conferentie met D. Arminio-Vertooch voor de E. E. Heeren Staten gedaen over de leere ende beleydt D. Arminii. 4to.

——— **Gomarus** (F.) Disputatie von J. Arminii aengaende de goddelijcke predestinatie. 4to. *Leyden.*

——— **Tuke** (Thomas) The High-Way to Heaven; or, the Doctrine of Electine, Effectuall Vocation, Justification, Sanctification, and Eternall Life, etc. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **W.** (T.) Two Sermons, the first, the Practice of the Saints; the second, the Perseverance of the Saints. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Rispol.** (Joan. Mal. de) Status controversiæ prædefinitionum ac prædeterminationum cum libero arbitrio. 8vo. *Par.*

——— **Artomedes** (Sebastianus) Predigten von der Gnadenwahl der kinder gottes über den Spruch Matt. xx. vule sind beruffen, &c. 4to. *Leips.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

1609. **Kenchen** (Joh.) Beständiges Bekänntnis von Gottes Gnadenwahl. 8vo. *Hall in Sachs.*

——— **Pitiscus** (Bart.) Predigt von der Gnaden Wahl Gottes. 4to. *Amb.*

——— **Hockerus** (Jac.) Disp. de Doctrina Prædestinationis. 4to. *Frib. Brisq.*

The Author was a Roman Catholic.
Another Ed., 1614.

——— **Oer** (Reinerus) Quæstio de differentia inter Calvinistas, Pelagianos, et Catholicos, in negotio Prædestinationis. 8vo. *Mogunt.*

A Roman Catholic.

——— **Meisnerus** (Balth.) Disp. sub præsidio D. Leonh. Hutteri de Peccatorum..... 4to. *Witt.*

Also in his "Schola Academ.," *Francof.*, 1625. 8vo; Author of "Anthropologia," *Witteb.*, 1627, 4to; and "De Protoplastis ad Imaginem Dei Creatis," *Witteb.*, 1657, 4to; and "Quæstiones vexatæ," *Plaviæ*, 1679, 4to.

——— **Donteclock** (R.) Psamen—spreeckinghe van de vertaelde theses, ofte disputatien: de eene F. Gomari, de andere J. Arminii aenghende de goddelicke predestinatie, *etc.* 4to. *Delf.*

Same year, F. Gomari waerschouwinghe over de vermaninghe aen R. D. Donteclock, *etc.*, 4to.

——— **[Corvinus** (J. A.)] Christelicke vermaninghe aen R. Donteclock, over sijne Psamensprekinghe van de vertaelde Theses ofte Disputatie F. Gomari ende J. Arminij aengaende de goddelijcke predestinatie. 4to. *s'Gravenhaghe.*

——— Disputatii P. Bertie van de Ketterije Pelagii ende Cœlestii. 4to.

——— **Arminius** (Jac.) Disputationes xxiv. 8vo. *Lugd. Bat.*

——— **Suarez** (Franc.) De divina gratia. *Lugd.*

This Ed. not in Brit. Mus.
Various Ed., *Conimb.*, 1619, fol., pp. 1032; *Lugd.*, 1620 and 1628, fol.; *Mogunt.*, 1620, fol., pp. 446; and 1621, fol., pp. 576.

——— **Sylvius** (Franc.) Explicatio doctrinæ S. Thomæ, et confirmatio thesium et impertinentium ex eodem de motione primi Motoris disputatorum in collegio regio Duaci. 4to. *Duaci.*

This Ed. not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Cumel** (Fr.) Variarum Disputationum, tomi tres. fol. *Lugd.*

Vol I.—De Præscientia Dei circa futura contingentia. Vol 2.—De Libero Arbitrio ipsius cum Gratia Dei convenientia et assensu; de Prædestinatione, &c.
The Author was a Roman Catholic.

——— **Tossanus** (Dan.) Doctrina de Prædestinatione, cum 2 Epistolis responsoriis ad N. Serarium. 4to. *Hanov.*

Calvinistic.

1609. **Becanus** (Mart.) Quæstiones miscellaneæ, de fide hæreticis servanda. Contra quendam Calvinistam Batavum. 8vo, pp. 110. *Mogunt.*

——— ——— Quæstio de differentia inter Calvinistas, Pelagianos et Catholicos super prædestinatione, &c. 8vo, pp. 92. *Mogunt.*

——— **Cudsemius** (Petrus) De desperata Calvini causa tractatus brevis..... 8vo. *Mogunt.*

——— **Goulart** (Sim.) Traité de l'assurance Chretienne.

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Willet** (And., *D.D.*) Tractatus de Gratia Generi humano in primo parente collata, de lapsu Adami, Peccato Originali, Prædestinatione, et libero Arbitrio. 8vo. *Amst.*

Two other Eds., *Lugd. Bat.*, 1618 and 1633, 8vo. No Ed. of this work is in the Brit. Mus. The Author is best known for his *Synopsis Papisme.* He was a learned Puritan, and died 1621.

1610. **Lydius** (J.) Dry tractaetgens vande ordre int beroepen ende beleydinge der jaerlijcsche synoden., I. D. J. Arminii.....Waerby ghevœcht is een corte wederlegginghe desselven, &c. 4to.

——— **Perkins** (Will.) De libera dei gratia et libero hominis arbitrio. 8vo. *Oppenh.*

——— **Faber** (Frid.) Dissertatio Theologica de Viribus humanæ naturæ. 4to. *Tubingæ.*

——— **Arminius** (J.) Nieuve jaars claach-liedt over de doodt van. J. A. 4to. [*Amst*].

——— **Hockerus** (Jonas) Prior pars Speculi Logico-Theologici de Prædestinatione et Eucharistia contra Calvinistas. 4to. *Tub.*

Posterior pars, 1612, *Tub.*, 4to.

——— **Borojus** (Lud.) Tract. de Prædestinatione et Reprobatione. 8vo. *Veronæ.*

Not in the Brit. Mus., see 1607.

——— **Lessius** (Leon.) Disp. de Gratia efficaci, Decretis Divinis, Libertate Arbitrii, et Præscientia Dei conditionata. 4to. *Antv.*

——— ——— Disp. 2, de Prædestinatione, et reprobatione angelorum et hominum. 4to. *Antv.*

——— ——— Disp. 3, De Prædestinatione Christi. 4to. *Antv.*

In 1586, le P. Lessius fit soutenir de conart avec le P. Hamelius, des Theses qui paraissaient opposées aux sentiments de S. Thomas. La faculté de Théologie de Louvain censura 34 propositiones tirées des Thèses de Lessius. Elle crut voir que ce Pere, en combattant le *baianisme*, s'était jeté dans le *semi-pelagianisme.* Stapleton, professeur à Louvain, se déclara contre cette censure dans une lettre à l'Evêque de Middelbourg, insérée dans l'Histoire des congregations *De auxiliis* du Père de Meyere, p. 32. L'Université de Douai se joignit à celle de Louvain. Il règne dans la censure de Douai un air de vivacité qui montre un peu de passion. Lessius en ayant appelé à Rome, Sixte V. fit examiner dans une congregation la doctrine condamnée dans Lessius, et après un rigoureux examen, ses propositions fuerent déclarées *sanæ doctrinæ articuli.* La censure fut cassée et le jugement pontifical publié à Louvain, par ordre du nonce Octavio, évêque de Cajazzo en 1588.—*De Bacher.*

Lessius died 1622.

1610. **Bertius** (P.) Aen-spraeck aan F. Gomarum, op zyne Bedenckinge over de Lijck-oratie..... op J. Arminius. 4te. *Leyden.*

——— **Cudsemius** (Petrus) Vivum Speculum, in quo vera et apostolica Christi ecclesia apparet. pontificorum, Lutheranorum et Calvinistarum trius calculo approbatum. 8vo. *Col. Agrip.*

——— **Vorstius** (Con.) Tractatus Theologicus de Deo, sive de Natura et attributis Dei. 4to. *Steinfurti.*

K. James I. drew up a catalogue of the heresies he found in this work, and ordered the book to be burnt in London and the two English Universities.

——— **C.** (J.) Handelinge van de Prædestinatie, perservantie ende Vrye Wille des Menschen ..Tegeus de Calumnien .. Bertij ende haren ghevolge...Door.....J. C. 4to. *Delft.*

——— **Becanus** (Martin) De Triplici Sacrificio, Naturæ, legis et Gratiæ. 8vo. *Mog.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Dedekennus** (Geo.) Grundfüst der trostreichen Gnadenwahl gottes. 8vo. *Hamb.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Mentzerus** (Balth.) Bericht von den IV., stücken Christlicher-Lehre, nemblich von Fauff. Abendmahlunt .... und Gnadenwahl. 12mo. *Giessæ.*

Same year and place, "Analysis cap. ix., x., xii. Epistolæ ad Romanos," 8vo.

——— **Schroderus** (Joh.) Analysis Theol. et Scholast. in cap. IX Epist. ad Rom. 8vo. *Giessæ.*

The date in Lipenius Bibl. Real. Theol. ii., 683 as 1611. Another Ed., *Giessæ*, 1620, 8vo.

——— **Weberus** (Joh.) Elenchus Prodromi, quem Joh. Lampadius in Subsidium censuræ ubiquitatis et specialiter dogmatis de Prædestinatione Calvinistarum absoluta emisit. 4to. *Giessæ.*

1610. **Cupus** (P.) Aenwysinghe van de oubehoorlicke wyse zan dœn, die A. Smoutius ghepleecht heeft ..tot waers chouwinghe van vele...die .....teghen Arminium opgeruyt zijn. 4to. *Rotterdam.*

——— ——— Handelinge van de Prædestinatie...tegens de calumnien...Cupij, etc. 4to.

——— **Gomarus** F.) Teghen-Bericht jeghens...F. Gomari Waerschouwinge, &c. 4to. [*Leyden*].

——— **Alvarez** (Did.) De Auxiliis Divinæ Gratiæ et Humani Arbitrii Viribus et Libertate, ac legitima ejus cum Efficacia eorundum Auxiliorum Concordia, libri XII. fol. *Romæ.*

Other Eds. were published *Lug.*, 4to, 1611, fol. 1620, and *Colon. Agrip.*, 1621, 1632, and 1635, 4to, *Duac.*, 1635, 8vo. Respecting this celebrated work see Walchii Bibl. Theol. i, 81—2.

——— Apologia pro Christiano Batavo, non Calvinista, contra Martini Becani Quæstiones Miscellaneas de fide Hæreticis servanda. pp. 260. 8vo. *Lond.*

To this work Becan replied in a work entitled "Quæstiones Batavicæ in Batavum Calvinistam."

——— **Bonald** (Franc.) La divine œconomie d l'Eglise et le haut prix du bénéfice de la rédemption et vocation au christianisme, avec les moyens de la conserver et d'en faire son salut. 12mo. *Lyon.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

There was another ed. at the same place in 1612, and *Colon.*, 1611, 12mo.

——— Absolutio Quæstionis de generali Damnatione per Adam. *Paris.*

——— **Verdu** (Bl.) Relectiones duæ; Altera contra scientiam mediam, et altera pro divinorum auxiliorum efficacia. 4to. *Barcinon.*

——— **Klimken** (Laur.) Kurtzer bericht von der gnadenwahl der kinder gottes zum ewigen leben. 8vo. *Herborn.*

Another Ed., 1712, 8vo, *s. l.* The author was a Calvinist.

——— **Forsterus** (Jo.) Trias controversiarum theologicarum de induratione, absoluto decreto et universali electione. 4to. *Wittb.*

See Walch ii, 647. The same year the author pub. "Systema præcipuarum Controversiarum inter Lutheranos et Calvinianos," which is not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Keckius** (Jo.) Einfœltige und aus gotteswort beslændige bekænntnis von gottes gnadenwahl, &c. 8vo. *Halæ.*

——— **Scharpius** (Joh.) Tractatus de misero hominis statu sub peccato. 8vo. *Genev.*

(Free Will). Another Ed., *Genevæ*, 1618, 8vo; also author of "Tract. de Justificatione hominis coram Dei," 1609, 8vo.

1610. **Behmens** (Joh.) Predigten Königsberg. 4to. *Paris.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— ——— De Distinctione divinæ Voluntatis in Anteced. et Conseq. 4to. *Regiom.*

——— Ecclesiæ Lugdunensis Liber adversus Joh. Scotum de Prædestinatione et Præscientia. *Paris.*

(Roman).

——— **Coornhert** (D. V.) Concerning the forbearance and decrees of God's deliberation. pp. 113. 4to. *Goudæ.*

A rare Dutch Tract, with criticisms by R. Donteclock and the answers by Coornhert. Also treats of original sin.

——— **Arminius** (Jac.) Explanations of, concerning his views, &c., of Predestination, as also of some other points. By his widow and her brothers. pp. 52. 4to. *Leyden.*

Written in Dutch, and rare.

——— A Little Boat out of the Ship of the Second Answer of D. V. Coornhert against the replies of the Preachers. Disputation concerning original sin. pp. 23. 4to. *Goudæ.*

A rare Dutch tract.

1611. **Mencelius** (Joach.) De Cognitione Dei ex lumine Gratiæ et Gloriæ Tractatus Theologo-Philosophicus. 12mo. *s.l.*

Also author of "De Deo et triplici ejus Patefactione, ex lumine naturæ, gratiæ et gloriæ,' *Hanov.*, 1619, 8vo; *Francof.*, 1624, 8vo.

——— **Helwys** (Thos.) God's Decree is not the cause of any man's sin or condemnation: and that all men are redeemed by Christ, and that no infants are condemned. Ten demands concerning God's Decrees. 8vo. [*Lond.*]

——— **Wilson** (Thos.) Concerning God's Eternal purpose, ór Predestination. 8vo. *Lond.*

A Puritan writer.

——— Theolog. Mansfeldensium nothwendige Widerlegung des von D. Johann. Kecken ausgesprengten Bucks darinn der Huberische Jrthum von der allgemeinen Prædestination verthedige werden will. 8vo. *Leipzig.*

——— **Ledesma** (Pet. de) Tractatus de Divinæ Gratiæ auxiliis, circa illa verba '*Omnia opera nostra operatus es in nobis Domine.*' fol. *Salam.*

——— **Diotellenius** (Franc.) Opuscula de concursu Dei ad actus liberos voluntatis creatæ, ac de Scientia quam Deus habet de futuris contingentibus. 8vo. *Lugd., et Francof.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

1611. [**Coornhert** (D. V.)] Of Godt in siju Predestineren.....siet op des Menschen doen dan niet.
pp. 31. 4to. [*Delft*].
This tract is rare.

——— **Serarius** (Nic.) Opuscula Theologica. 3 vols. fol. *Mogunt.*
Vol. 2, p. 196. The author was a learned Jesuit and Prof. of languages, philosophy, and theology, at Wurtzburg, d. 1609. He was a strenuous defender of the Church of Rome against the Reformers, and wrote many works against Luther and his associates.

[1611]. **Padilla** (Antoine de) MS. De efficacia gratiæ, conciliorum et SS. Patrum auctoritatibus firmatum.
The author was a Jesuit, and Rector of the Colleges of Valladolid and Salamanque. The MS. is preserved in the former.

——— **Huber** (John) De libero arbitrio, das ist Catholische Lehre wieder der Kalvinischen, etc. 4to. *Braunsburg.*

——— **Westermann** (Geo.) *Resp.* Disputatio de peccato originis. 4to.

——— **Dedekennus** (Geo.) Tractatus de Peccatorum causis. 8vo. *Francof.*
Very rare.

——— **Becanus** (Martinus) *Pres.* Privilegia Calvinistarum.
pp. 119, 8vo. *Mogunt.*
Reprinted at *Duaci*, 1612, 12mo. Translated into German by P. J. Alcket, *Colon.*, 1684. 12mo.

——— ——— Tractatus de Deo et attributis divinis; in quo Catholicorum sententia breviter explicatur, et novi quorundam Calvinistarum atheismi refelluntur. 8vo. *Mogunt.*
Contains a chapter on Predestination and Reprobation. Becan was one of the ablest professors of his time. He was happy in a clear conception, and could express himself so intelligibly to his scholars, even upon the more intricate points, that several universities were at strife which should entertain him.—*Dodd.*

——— **Trithemius** (Joh.) Tract. de Providentia Dei. 8vo. *Altorsii.*
The work was publ. before in his "Liber VIII. Quæstionum," *Francof.*, 1569, 8vo.
Trithemius is described by Arpe as "Literarum restaurator fœlicissimus, orbisque eruditi magnum decus. Ingenio enim pereximio et arcanas obscurasque evolvit scientias, et res gestas egregiè tradidit, et in Theologiæ mysteriis explicandis ita versatus est ut anteponatur ei nemo, pauci etiam pares putentur."—*Theat. Fati.*, 53.
For an acct. of the author see Wharton's app. to Cave, ed. 1693, p. 113.

——— **Meisnerus** (Balt.) Philosophia sobria, *i.e.*, Consideratio quæstionum Philosophicarum in Controversiis Theologicis inter Calvinianos et Orthodoxos occurrentium. 8vo. *Geissæ Hess.*
See his Quæstionib. vexatis, p. 16, "An peccatum originis formaliter sit aliquid positivi."

——— **Vorstius** (Adol.) Apolegetica exegesis locorum aliquot ex libro ejusdem de Dei, etc. 4to. *Lug. Bat.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

1611. Joh. Piscatoris responsio ad Conr. Vorstii amicam duplicationem, in qua disseritur præcipue de divina prædestinatione. *Herb.*
Another Ed., *Goudæ*, 1618, 4to.

——— **Dent** (Arthur) A sermon of God's Providence.
4th *impres.*, B.L. 8vo. *Lond.*
6th Ed., *Lond.*, 1616, 12mo.
The Author was a Puritan and minister of Conter Souberry.

——— **Cramerus** (Daniel) Sana doctrina de Prædestinatione in brevem summam redacta, etc. 8vo. *Stetini.*

——— **Weigel** (Val.) Kirch-od., Hans-Postille. 4to. *Neust.*
Parts I. and II. treat of original sin. See his "Informator, Part iii. de Clave David, cxii. (original sin)," also his "De gûldne Griff. Od. Anleitung alle Dinge obne Irrthum zu erkennen." *Halle*, 1613, 4to; *Franckf.*, 1697, 8vo; in which he also treats of the same subject.

——— **Wilson** (Thomas) Jacob's Ladder; or, A short treatise laying forth ...the severall degrees of God's eternall purpose, whereby His grace descends upon the Elect, and the Elect ascend to the predestinate glory. 12mo. *Lond.*
The Author was one of the six preachers in the Cathedral Church of Canterbury.

——— **Hinchelmannus** (Petr.) Calvinismi errores præcipui veri orthodoxi in omnibus fere articulis fidei.
4to. *Rostoch.*
(Predestination, providence, free will).

——— Traité du Delict Commun.
8vo. *Paris.*

——— **Schleupnerus** (Christ.) Der nothwendigen wiederlegung des von D. Jo. Kecken ausgesprengten buchs.
8vo. *Lips.*
(Defence of Huber's Predestination).
Lipenius Biblio. Theolog., pt. ii., p. 48, memorat: Kechii responsionem ad quæstionem: utrum prædestinatio ad vitam æternam sit universalis: an particularis? a Joam. Webero discussam, *Hal.*, *MD.CXXII.*, 8vo. Walch ii., 648.

——— **Augustine** (Aur.) Liber de gestis Pelagii nunc primum editus, studio Marci Velæri. 8vo. *Aug. Vind.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Ram** (Gasp.) Tractatus de divinis præmotionibus, seu efficacia divinæ causalitatis. 4to. *Oxon.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Lubbertus** (Sibrandus) Declaratio responsionis Conradi Vorstii.
8vo. *Frankeræ.*

——— **Bertius** (Pet.) Theoremata de perseverantia Sanctorum, præside P. B. proposita. 4to. *Lug. Bat.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Sluterus** (Severinus) Antithesis Philanthropias Divinæ, et Misanthropias Calvinianæ, circa æternam Hominum Salutem, etc. 8vo. *Hanb.*
A Lutheran.

1611. **Arminius** (J.) Een corte ende eenvondige antvoorde. op vier poincten by Dr. J. A....tegenghesproken als..... niet noodich om te gelooven aengaende de predestinatie Godts. Met een kordt ondersoeck...handelende van de predestinatie Godts, met xx volch-redenen. 8vo. *Schiedam.*

——— Concerning God's Election; By God through His own working alone, without any co-operation of man, alone by His own blessed power. Second conversation between a Reformed Calvinist and D. Demostenes.

——— Concerning Reprobates; Of God's Predestination through his abandoning and of necessity, and not through men's sins cause is of each man's eternal damnation. Third conversation between a Reformed Calvinist and D. Demostenes. pp. 31. 4to.

A rare Dutch tract.

——— **Donteclock** (Reginald) Solid Instruction out of God's Holy Word concerning Predestination, of the Eternal Election of God. pp. 76. 4to. *Leyden.*

——— Trustworthy questions concerning the doctrine of Predestination. pp. 10. 4to. *Dordrecht.*

A rare Dutch tract written to prove that the Ch. of England agrees with the Church of the Netherlands on the doctrine of Predestination.

——— **Polanus** (Amand.) Short Comments of, concerning some at present contested articles of Christ's religion; God's eternal election to Grace, the rejection of the wicked, and the foreknowledge of God. pp. 38. 4to. *Rotterd.*

A Dutch tract in question and answer.

1612. **Julius** (Casp.) Christus Salvator Catholicus, das der himmlische Vatter es mit aller Menschen Seeligkeit Vätterlich meyne, &c. 4to. *Leip.*

——— **Rithingdonus** (Sim.) De Calvinistarum Privelegiis (cum G. de Pratis Epistola contra ea) judicium adversus M. Becanum. 8vo. *Mog.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Venator** (Adol. Tect.) Declaratio Ordinibus Hollandiæ et Westfrisiæ exhibita, quâ respondet 6 Quæstionibus super Doctrinâ ejus à senatu Ecclesiastico Alcmariano propositis. 4to *Lug. Bat.*

Also Author of "Replic. ad Confut. Ministr. Dordrac. Declarat."

——— **Ursinus** (Zach.) Opera Theologica edita studio et opera L. Reuteri. 3 vols, fol. *Heidelbergæ.*

Expli. Catech., Pt. ii. de Prædest.

1612. **Damis** (Frid.) De Voluntate Dei erga genus humanum et universali Christi merito. 8vo. *Giessæ.*

——— **Paræus** (Dav.) Castigatio in Bellarmini librum de Gratiâ primi hominis. 8vo. *Heid.*

See 1613.

——— **Albo** (Jos.) Ikkarim seu Fundamentorum Judaïcæ Religionis contra Christianos. *Ven.*

Lib. iv., cap. 1.

The Author was a Spaniard who assisted, in 1412, at a conference between the Christians and Jews. The above work was written in 1425, against the Gospels. It was first printed in 1486.

——— **Petavius** (Dion.) Versio et Notæ ad Synesium. fol. *Paris.*

A book De Providentia.

The author was a Jesuit, best known for his "Opus de Theologicis Dogmatibus," &c., *Antv.*, 1790, 6 vols, fol.; *Venet*, 1745, 6 vols, fol.; best Ed., *Venet.*, 1757, 6 vols, fol.; *Paris*, 1865—67, 8 vols, 8vo.

——— **Hooker** (Richard) A Learned and Comfortable Sermon [on Habak, i., 4], of the certaintie and perpetuitie of faith in the Elect; especially of the Prophet Habakkuk's faith. 4to. *Oxford.*

The Author was known as "The "Judicious Hooker." His school of divinity is said to have occupied a middle place, between Cranmer and the school of Laud. The Arminians have claimed him as an ally, but he might be almost with equal justice claimed by the Calvinists. He died 1600, aged 67.

The same year was printed (it had only been pub. by dispersing written copies previously), the supplication of Mr. Walter Travers, Lecturer of the Temple, to the Privy Council, against Hooker, one of the charges being that "he had taught certain things concerning Predestination otherwise than the word of God doth."

——— **Weberus** (Joh.) Quæstio: Utrum Prædestinatio ad Vitam æternam sit universalis, an particularis? Scholastice discussa, et libello Joh. Keckii, I. U. D., et consist. Hallens. assess. opposita. *Giessæ.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Wincklemann** (Joh.) Tröstliche Lehre von der Gnaden-Wahl. 12mo. *Giessæ.*

Also Author of "Disp. de Electione," *Giessæ*; "Disp. de Qq. ad Doctrinam de Prædestinatione pertinentibus." "De Problematis nonnullis oppositis commento Calvinistarum," "De æterna Prædestinatione," "De Prædestinationæ Filiorum Dei;" also "Notationes in Epistolam ad Romanos per Analysin et Dispp.," *Franc. ad M.*, 1614, and "Thesium Theologicarum quaternarius..... De Electione ad Vitam æternam," *Argent.*, 1613, 4to. The Author was a Lutheran. None of the above works are in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Rechtenbach** (Leonh.) De Prædestinatione, contra Zuinglio-Calvinisticos. *Lips.*

1612. **Tilenus** (Daniel) Consideratio sententiæ J. Arminii de prædestinatione, gratia Dei, et libero arbitrio hominis. pp. xiii., 75, 8vo. *Francofurti.*

Rare, also same year *Heidelb.*

——— **Andreæ** (Simon) De Libero hominis Arbitrio. 4to. *Hafniæ.*

——— **Vorstius** (Conr.) Parasceve ad Collationem amicam cum Joh. Piscatore. 4to. *Goudæ.*

(*Predestination*). Not in the Brit. Mus. Another Ed., *Lugd. Bat.*, 1613.

The same year he wrote "Christiana et Modesta responsio ad articulos quosdam nuper ex Anglia transmissos," *Lugd. Bat.*, 1612, 4to; and undated "Brevis responsio ad postremam declarationem Ministrorum Ecclesiæ Leowardensis in Frisia," *Lugd. Bat.*, 8vo; and "Prodromus plenioris responsi, suo tempore secuturi ad Declarationem D. Sibr. Luberti, &c.," *Lugd. Bat.*, 1612, 4to.

——— Antisocinus, *hoc est*, Confutatio omnium et singulorum errorum, quos olim Ariani, Ebionitæ, Samosateniani, Pelagiani, et Tritheitæ, propugnarunt. 8vo. *Francofurti.*

———**Bertius** (Pet.) Hymenæus desertor, sive de Apostasiâ Sanctorum problemata duo. 4to. *Francof.*

Another Ed., *Lugd. Bat.*, 1615.

There seems to have been a previous Ed., *Lug. Bat.*, 1601, see Biblio. Heinsiana, 1682, p. 35. 1612, in Dutch [*Schiedam?*], 1613, 4to. Crocius replied to this, see 1616.

——— **Neodorpius** (Mart.) Lutherus orthodoxus; oder hertzensgrund Lutheri, das ist, in der wahren, alten, bestœndigen lehre des theuren mannes gottes und tapfern christen-heldens D. Martin Lutheri. 8vo. *Franckf.*

Another Ed., 1615, 8vo.

[1612]. **Aslacus** (Conr.) De Libero hominis Arbitrio, Disp. II. 4to. *Hafniæ.*

——— **Bulæus** (Justus) *Resp.* Explicatio primæ quæstionis in catechesi—De libero hominis arbitrio—De Providentia Dei. 4to.

——— **Campen** (Elias à) *Resp.* De primo peccato Adami. 4to.

——— **Arminius** (J.) Examen modestum libelli Gulielmi Perkinsii, de prædestinationis modo et ordine, itemque de amplitudine gratiæ divinæ. 8vo. *Lugd. Bat.*

Not in the British Museum.

A German translation, *Goudæ*, 1617, 4to. Twisse's reply, 1632, fol.

——— **Cudsemius** (Pet.) Hyperaspistes Apologeticus pro Tractatu de Desperata Calvini causâ, seu Quadripartiti Calvinistici examinis vexamen. 8vo. *Col. Agr.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Eglisemmius** (Geo.) Crisis Vorstiani responsi, qua Conrad Vorstius denuo Atheismi, &c., schismatis et ignorantiæ arguitur. 4to. *Delphis.*

1612. **Broeckerus** (Fred.) Antidotum præcipuorum errorum in Conr. Vorstii tractatu de Deo et in Apologetica exegesi comprehensorum. 4to. *Amst.*

——— **Schipperus** (Herm.) Articul von der Gnaden Wahl der Kinder Gott. 4to. *Giessæ.*

——— **Taylor** (Tho., *D.D.*) De Electione. *Cantbr.*

The author was a Puritan, and was a Fellow and Hebrew Lecturer at Christ's College, Camb.

——— **Lælius** (Laur.) Articulus de libero Arbitrio certis Thesibus comprehensus ac Rob. Bellarmini corruptelis oppositus. *Norib.*

——— **Nugno** (Did.) Ord. Præd. De Diviniis Auxiliis. fol. *Venet.*

Added to his Commentaries and Disputations on the 3rd part of Aquinas's Summa. These were in 2 vols.

——— **Zepper** (Wilhelm) Schriftuerlicke Onderwijsinghe in de leere van de Goddelijcke Predestinatie .....in hoochduytsch beschreven.....ende .....door een student.....int Latijn vertaelt, ende alsna.....in onse Neder duytsche tale overgheget door T. G. O. 4to. *Rotterdam.*

1613. **Piscator** (Jo.) Responsio apologet. ad Vorstii parasceven, in qua multa scripturæ dicta et imprimis ea, quæ loquuntur de doctrina prædestinationis, explicantur. 4to. *Herborn.*

——— ——— Notæ ad amicam collationem Vorstii. 4to. *Herborn.*

——— ——— Notæ ad Petrum Baronem de Prædestinatione. 8vo. *Hard.*

——— **Vorstius** (Conr.) Amica collatio cum Piscatore. 4to. *Goudæ.*

——— ——— Parænesis ad Sibrandum Lubbertum, qua ejus injuriæ et calumniæ refutantur. 4to. *Goudæ.*

Not in Brit. Mus.

——— **Lubbertus** (Sibrand.) Comment. ad XCIX errores Conr. Vorstii; et appendix de prædestinatione. 8vo. *Franeck.*

To this Vorstius replied as above—As to the discussion, see Walch Bibl. Theol. ii, 537. Lubbertus also wrote "Responsio ad Pietatem Hugonis Grotii," *Francqueræ*, 1614, 4to; "Bonafides," *Lugd. Bat.*, 1615, 4to; Epistolica disceptatio de Fide Justificante habita inter Sibr. Lub. et Pet. Bertium," *Francf. ad Od.*, 1613, 8vo; and "Declaratio responsionis Vorstii," *Amsterd.*, 1612, 8vo.

——— **Corvinus** (Joh. Arn.) Defensio sententiæ Arminii de prædestinatione, gratia Dei, libero arbitrio, &c., contra Tilenum. 8vo. *Lugd. Bat.*

——— **Arminius** (J.) Epistola ad Hippol à Collibus. 8vo. *Francof.*

——— ——— Amica collatio cum D. Franciso Junio de Prædestinatione per literas habita. 8vo. *Lugd. Bat.*

1613. **Junius** (Franc.) Disquisitio ad Pet. Baronis Summam trium Sententiarum de Prædestinatione.
8vo. *Hardrov.*

——— **Baro** (Peter, *D.D.*) Summa trium sententiarum de Prædestinatione, &c.
8vo. *Hardrov. et Amst.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Hutton** (Mat., *Archbp. of York*) Explicatio doctrinæ de Electione, Prædestinatione, ac Reprobatione cui præmittuntur Lambethani articuli.
8vo. *Hardrov.*
Reprinted 'cum aliorum theologorum ejusdum argumenti scriptis,' *Helmst.*, 1614, 8vo; *Amst.*, 1614, 4to. See Walch Bibl. Theol. i, 271; Lipenius Theol. Real. i, 588.

——— **Whitakerus** (Guil.) Prælectio contra universalem gratiam, et concio de Prædestinatione et certitudine salutis. 8vo. *Hardrov.*
Does not seem to be in B. M.

——— **Sainete Marie** (Gabr. de) Traité pour l'éclaircissement et résolution de quelques controversies, touchant la Predestination et l'autorité de S. Ecriture pour reponse à la lettre du de Tesserant. *St. Malo.*

——— **Amesius** or **Ames** (Will.) Disceptatio Scholastica de Arminii sententia, qua electionem omnem particularem fidei prævisæ docet inniti, inter Nicol. Grevinchovium et Guil. Amesium.
pp. 70. 4to. *Amst.*
Extremely rare.
Not in the Brit. Mus.
Grevinchovius was a minister at Rotterdam. Ames was at the Synod of Dort, and informed K. James's ambassador from time to time of the debates. He d. at Rotterdam, 1633, having achieved a name by his controversial works. He was a strict Calvinist in doctrine, and of the persuasion of the Independents with regard to the subordination and power of Classes and Synods. In his work "De Conscientia," under the head 'De Hæresi,' he puts the question, An Remonstrantes sint hæretici? And the answer he gives is this:—"Remonstrantium sententia, prout à vulgo ipsis faventium recipitur, non est proprie hæresis, sed periculosus error in fide, ad hæresin tendens. Prout vero a quibusdam eorum defenditur, est hæresis Pelagiana; quia gratiæ internæ operationem efficacem necessariam esse negant ad conversionem, et fidem ingenerandum," lib. IV. c. IV., Q, 4. Ames was the author of "The Marrow of Sacred Divinity," *Lond.*, 16—, 4to, pp. 338, in which he treats p. 23 of the Decrees of God, p. 39, of Providence, p. 48, of Man's fall and the consequences, p. 103, of Predestination, p. 109, of Calling; also of a dispute with Grevinchovius "de reconciliatione per mortem Christi omnibus ac singulis hominibus impetrata." *Roterod.*, 1625, 4to.

——— **Neidingerus** (Dan.) Disputatio in causa prædestinationis, adversus disputationem Jacobi Hackeri.
4to. *Mantuæ.*

——— **Martinius** (Matth.) Comment. de gubernatione mundi. 8vo. *Brem.*
A German translation, *Brem.*, 1615, 12mo.

1613. **Glaserus** (Frid.) Predigt von der ewigen Versehung oder Gnadenwahl derer Kinder Gottes zum ewigen Leben. 4to. *Leipz*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Faber** (Phil.) Disputationes Theologicæ. *Venet.*
Contains:—"De Scientia conditionata Prædestinatione, concursus Dei cum causis secundis," &c.

——— **Paræus** (David) Castigatio in 6 lib. Bellarmini de amissione gratiæ et statu peccati. 12mo. *Heidelb.*

——— ——— Orat. de Synodo Nationali Dordracena. 4to. *Heidelb.*

——— **Contzen** (Adam, *S.J.*) Defensio libri Cardinalis Roberti Bellarmini de gratia primi hominis, contra castigationes et explicationes Davidis Paræi.
12mo. *Mogunt.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.
By some Roman Catholics he is considered one of the ablest advocates in their controversies with the Protestants.

——— Autre défense de Bellarmin contre le livre de Pareus intitulés "Roberti Bellarmini de amissione, gratiæ et statu peccati, libri sex, quorum tres posteriores tractant de peccato originis, explicati et castigati a Davide Pareo."
12mo. *Heidlb.*

——— **Lyserus** (Polyc.) Disp. de Æterna Electione credentium et Reprobatione incredulorum contra Am. Polanum.
4to. *Witteb.*
Lipenius has the date 1612, Bibl. Real. Theol. ii, 665, but see i. 586.

——— **Becanus** (Mart.) Tract. scholasticus de Libero Arbitrio.
pp. 222. 8vo. *Mogunt.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Carleton** (Geo., *D.D.*) Consensus Ecclesiæ Catholicæ contra Tridentinos, &c. 8vo. *Lond. et Franof.*
Treats of Grace, &c. The year this work was published Carleton took the degree of *D.D.* at Oxford. He became Bishop of Llandaff in 1618, and the same year was chosen one of the delegates sent out by K. James I. to the Synod of Dort. He was translated to Chichester, 1619, and d. 1628.

——— **Augustine** (Aur.) Sententiæ ex omnibus ejus operibus à S. Prospero excerptæ, editæ studio Joannis a Fuchte. 8vo. *Helmæst.*

——— **Drexelius** (Hier.) Zodiacus Christianus locupletatus; seu Signa XII. divinæ Prædestinationis.
12mo. *Monaci.*
A 2nd Ed. same place, 1622, pp. 305, 8vo, with curious engravings by G. Sadeler; a 3rd, 1625., a 4th, *Col. Agrip.*, without date, 12mo, pp. 186; a 6th, *Monaci.*, 1629, 24mo, pp. 234; 7th, *Col. Agrip.*, 1632, 16mo; *Monaci*, 1632, 24mo; *Colon.*

Agrip.,1634, 16mo. An English translation,*Lond.*, 1647, 18mo, with 12 fig. by Hollar. The only Eds. in the Brit. Mus. are those of 1632 and 1634. A German Ed., *Munchen.*, 1624, 12mo.

The author was a learned Jesuit who died 1623. The number of copies of the various practical works of the author published at Munich alone from 1620 to 1642 has been estimated at 170,700.

Opera Omnia, *Antv.*, 1659, &c., 32 vols. 18mo; *Lugd.*, 1675, 4 tom. fol.

1614. **Tarnovius** (Paul.) Disputatio de Peccato Originis. 4to. *Rost.*

——— De Arminii sententia, qua electionem omnem particularem, fidei prævisse docet inniti, disceptatio scholastica inter N. Grevinchovium et G. Amesium: cui annectitur oratio D. Esteii de certitudine salutis et perseverantia Sanctorum non intercisa. 4to. *Amst.*

——— **Lessius** (Leon.) De Providentiâ Numeris et animæ Immortalitate. 8vo. *Antv.*

Scarce. Other Ed. *Antv.*, 1617, 8vo; *Venet.*, 1625, fol., scarce; *Antv.*, 1642, 4to; 1651, 8vo. An English Ed., *Lond.*, 1651, 8vo. See 1637.

——— **Chateillon** (S.) S. Castellionis Dialogi IV. de Prædestinatione, etc. 8vo. *Goudæ.*

Responsio ad Martinum Borrhaum de Prædestinatione, etc. See Opera, 1613, 4to.

Another Ed. *Francofurti ad Mœnum*, 1696, 8vo.

——— **Essenius** (And.) Oratio de Certitudine Perseverantiæ. 4to. *Amst.*

Rare.

——— Ordinum Hollandiæ et Westfrisiæ Decretum pro Pace Ecclesiarum, munitum Scripturæ, Conciliorum, Patrum confessionum et Theologorum testimoniis. 4to. *Ultrajecti.*

(*Arminianism*). Also *Lug. Bat.*, 4to.

——— **Fabrus** (Zach.) Vera Electorum Nobilitas, gratiosa libertas, Principalis et Regalis Dignitas. 4to. *Leip.*

Also author of "Themata de Deo, de natura et attributis essentialibus Dei," *Lips.*, 1619, 4to.

——— **Corvinus** (Arnold.) Responsio ad Jo. Bogermanni annotationes, quibus vindicatam ab Hugone Grotio pietatem illustrium ordinum Hollandiæ et Westphaliæ denuo impugnavit. 4to. *Lug. Bat.*

Another Ed., *Leidæ.*, 1618, 4to.

To this Author, Walch attributes two dialogues entitled "Fur Prædestinatus," without name of place or year, 8vo. But the work is usually assigned to Episcopius.

——— **Lauterbach** (Erh.) Ausmusterung des Calvinischen *Monstri*, *Absolutum Decretum* genannt, oder III. Evangelische Predigten von der ewigen Gnadenwahl. 4to. *Leip.*

Also author of "De Prædestinatione," *Leip.*, 4to, in German.

——— **Becanus** (Mart.) Tituli Calvinistarum explicati. 8vo. *Mogunt.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

1614. **Bogermannus** (Joh.) Annotationes ad duas priores partes Pietatis Grotii, ubi causa Vorstii et Remonstrantium tractatur. 4to. *Leovardiæ.*

This work was replied to by Corvinus, see above.

Barlæus also wrote on the same subject, *Lug. Bat.*, 1615, 4to.

The reply is, but the work of Bogermann is not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Mullerus** (Geo.) Disput. de Prædestinatione. 4to. *Jenæ.*

——— **Martinius** (Mat.) Epitome S. Theologæ. 4to. *Brenæ.*

Lib. ii, et iv. Predestination from the Calvinistic point of view.

——— **Hockerus** (Jac.) Analysis Disputationis Urciani de Prædestinationis causa. 4to. *Frib. Bris.*

The author was a Roman Catholic.

——— Explicatio Doctrinæ de Electione, Prædestinatione, etc. 4to. *Amstel.*

By Matthæus, Arch. of York.

——— **Wilson** (Thos.) A Commentarie upon the Romans. 4to.

Other Ed., *Lond.*, 1627, fol.; 1653, 4to. There is little or nothing however on the subjects of this list.

——— **Byfield** (Nic.) An Essay concerning the assurance of God's love and of man's salvation. 8vo. *Lond.*

Not in Brit. Mus.

The author was an eminent Puritan Divine, Vicar of Isleworth, 1615. "He was a man of profound judgment, strong memory, sharp wit, quick invention, and unwearied industry..... He had a singular gift in diving into the depths of those points which he undertook to handle."—*Gouge.*

——— **Zanchius** (Hier.) Speculum Christianum, containing three tracts: of the end of the world; of the Perseverance of the Saints; an abridgment of his Lectures; Englished by H[enry] N[elson]. 8vo. *Lond.*

Not apparently in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Piscator** (Jo.) Tractatus de Gratia Dei. 8vo. *Herb.*

——— **Paræus** (Dav.) Rob. Bellarmini de gratia et libero arbitrio libri sex, explicati et castigati. 8vo. *Heidelb.*

——— **Contzen** (Adam,) Crudelitas et Idolum Calvinistarum revelatum. 12mo. *Mogunt.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

This is a defence of three books concerning sin by Cardinal Bellarmine against David Paræus.

——— **Gaulthier** (Jac.) L'Anatomie du Calvinisme. 12mo. pp. 871. *Lyons.*

The author was a Jesuit.

——— Philo Judæus de Septenario; ejusdem fragmenta II. è lib. de Providentia, Græce, cura Davidis Hœschelii. 4to. *Aug.-Vindel.*

The 1st Ed. of the author's works, *Par.*, 1552. fol. Another with the above work, *Par.*, 1640, fol., and 1742, 2 vols. fol.; *Lipsiæ.*, 1828–30, 8 vols, 12mo.

1614. **Bertius** (Pet.) Apologeticus ad fratres Belgas, in quo calumniæ crimen, ipsi à Joan. Piscatore immerito impactum, diluitur. 4to. *Lug. Bat.*
Not in Brit. Mus.

——— **Lubbertus** (Sibr.) Responsio ad Pietatem Grotii. *Francof.*

1615. **Daniele** (Fidèle) Trattato della diuina Prouidenza, diuiso in tres libri. 4to. pp. 616. *Milano.*
The author was a Jesuit, who d. 1616, at Milan.

——— **Grevinchovius** (Nicol.) Dissert. de duabus quæstionibus, hoc tempore controversis, quarum prima est de reconciliatione per mortem Christi impetrata omnibus et singulis hominibus, altera de electione ex fide prævisa. 4to. *Roter.*
The author was a Dutchman and a Pastor of Rotterdam, being eminent amongst the Remonstrants. He is often referred to in Brandt's Reform. of the Low Countries, vol. iii., p. 175.

——— **Amesius** (Gul.) Disputatio inter Amesium et Grevinchovium de Reconciliatione per mortem Christi impetrata omnibus ac singulis hominibus et de electione ex fide prævisa. 4to. *Roter.*
Another Ed., *Amst.*, 1644, 12mo.
The author was a Doctor and Prof. of Theology in Rotterdam, d. 1634.

——— **Cole** (Nath.) The godly man's assurance; or a Christian's certaine resolution of his own Salvation. 4to. *Lond.*
Another Ed., *Lond.*, 1633, 4to.

——— **Bellarmine** (Cardinal) Disputationes, De Gratia generi humano de Amissione gratiæ et statu peccati, de Reparatione gratiæ per Jesum Christum fol. *Coloniæ.*
Not apparently in Brit. Mus.
For a complete account of this celebrated writer, see De Backer, Bibl. des Ecrivains de la Campagnie de Jesus, vol. i., pp. 61—84.
Also author of "De Lapsu Adami, Peccato Originis," etc., *Lug. Bat.*, 1618, 1633, 8vo; *Amst.*, 1609, 8vo.

——— **Vaninus** (Lucilus, afterwards Julius Cæsar) Amphitheatrum æternæ Providentiæ divino-magicum. sm. 8vo. pp. 336. *Lugd.*
Another Ed.; *Paris*, 1616, 8vo. The Author was burnt as an Archheritic at Toulouse in 1619. Arpe (Pet.-Frid) pub. a vindication of him, *Cosmopoli*; [*Rotterdam*] 1712, 8vo. See Walch, i. 754. The original edition of 1615 is excessively rare and valuable. His life with an abstract of his writings with a confutation of them, and Bayle's arguments on behalf of Vaninus's answer, *Lond.*, 1730, 8vo.

——— **Resenius** (Joh. Paul.) De Gratia Universali seu Salutari omnibus hominibus; contra Johannis Piscatoris. 4to. *Hafniæ.*
Another Ed., same place, 1620, 4to. In favour of Hemming.

——— God's arraignment of Hypocrites, with an enlargement concerning God's decree in ordering sinne.

1615. **Piscator** (Joh.) Responsio ad apologeticum Pet. Bertii de Prædestinatione. 4to. *Herb.*

——— [**Binet** (Etienne)] Marque de Predestination. *Rouen.*
Other Ed., *Rouen*, 1619, 12mo; *Lyons and Paris*, 1617, 1620. Not in Brit. Mus.

——— Pressior Declaratio sive Narratio processus omnis observati à Pastoribus Ecclesiarum quos Remonstrantes vocant, etc. 4to. *Lug. Bat.*
Appendix Pressioris Declarationis, *Lug. Bat.*, 1617, 4to. Another Ed., *Leidæ.*, 1616; 4to.; and appendix, *Ib.*, 1618, 8vo.

——— Christiana Declaratio eorum, quæ in Formula Concordiæ edita Tom. I Decreti Ordinum Belgic. cum verbo Dei et Doctrina hactenus in Ecclesiis Belgicis recepta consentiunt, vel ab iisdem dissentiunt. 4to. *Leidæ.*
(Arminianism.)

——— **Affelmannus** (Joh.) Trias Syllogismorum quorum (1) quod Deus Calvinistarum sit auctor peccatorum. 4to. *Rost.*

——— Disp. Leidensium, Gomari, Arminii, Trelcatii Syntagma. 8vo. *Leoward.*

——— **Spangenberg** (Cyriac.) VII Predigten von der ewigen Vorsehung und Göttlichen Gnaden-Wahl. 12mo. *Franckf. an der O.*

——— **Gisenius** (Joh.) Examen Disputat. Theologicæ in acad. Marpurgensi à Raph. Eglino Iconio, S. Theologicæ D. propositæ, in qua propugnatur Dogma Zwinglio-Calvinianorum, de absoluta quorundam ad Vitam æternam Electione et absoluta reliquorum Reprobatione. 4to. *Giessæ.*
Another Ed., *Routh. ad Visurg.*, 1627. Also author of "Analytica Responsio ad Disp. Poëticam Raph. Eglini de absoluta quorumdam Electione."

——— **Gerhard** (John. M.) Loci Theologici. 4to. *Jenæ.*
Another Ed., *Gen.*, 1639, 10 vols, fol., of which Ed. vol. 2 contains De Providentia, electione et reprobatione, imagine Dei in homine ante lapsum, peccato originali, peccatis actualibus, libero arbitrio. Recent Ed., *Berol.*, 1863—67, 4to.

——— **Amesius** (Gul.) Collatio Hagiensis scripto habita de divina prædestinatione et ejus appendicibus, anno 1611. decreto Ordinum Hollandiæ vernaculè impressa et ex vernaculo sermone Latine facta per Henr. Brandium. 4to. *Zirizeæ.*

——— **Slad** (Mat.) Disceptationis cum Vorstio pars prima de blasphemiis, hæresibus et atheismis, quæ Jacobus Rex nigro carborie notavit, contra Vorstium. 4to. *Amst.*
The 1st Ed. of this was *Amst.*, 1612, 4to; according to Lipenius Bibl. Real. Theol., i. 437.
He also wrote "Examen Responsionis quam D.

Conrad. Vorstius edidit ad Articulos ex Anglia transmissos," *Lugd. Bat.*, 1612, 4to; and "Cum. Conr. Vorstio ulterior disceptatio," *Ib.*, 1614, 4to.

1615. **Brand** (Hen.) Collatio Delphis habita anno 1613 ubi deliberatum de remedio quod adhibendum esset malis Ecclesias Fœderati Belgii vexantibus. 4to. *Middelb.*

Not in Brit. Mus.

——— **Affelmannus** (Jo.) Manuductio ad Doctrinam de Prædestinatione, etc. 4to. *Rost.*

Not in Brit. Mus.

——— **Meisnerus** (Balth.) Anthropologica Sacra. 4to. *Witteb.*

Other Ed. same place, 1617, 4to; and 1618, 4to; 1627, 1663, 2 vols. 4to. Treats of the fall, Redemption, Election, and Predestination.

——— **Martinius** (Matth.) Bericht von Göttlicher Regierung aller Dinge, und Sonderlich des Menschen. 12mo. *Bremen.*

Election.

——— Vindiciarum Pars I. adversus Andr. Libavii Exercitationem de Hæreticis Prædestinationis Institutum Coburgi. 8vo. *Basil.*

——— **Bertius** (P.) Scriptura adversaria Collationis Hagiensis de divina Prædestinatione et capitibus annexis Latinitate donata a P. Bertio. 4to. *Lug. Bat.*

Calvinistic.

——— **Agricola** (Franc.) Rettung der Ehre Gottes, das ist, ausführlicher Beweis,dasGott kein Lust noch Gefallen habe einigen Menschen zu verdammen, &c. 12mo. *Coln.*

The author was a Roman Catholic.

Not in the Brit. Mus.

[1615]. **Frantzius** (Wolfg.) Assertio solidissima satisfactionis à D. N. Jesu Christo pro peccatis totius mundi. 4to. *Witteb.*

1616. Constantine Dell' humana perfettione per ragion de natura, d'arte, e di gratia. 4to. *Venet.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Borgia** (Franc. de) Le Miroir des œuvres chrestiennes, dv R. P. François de Borgia iadis Duc de Gandie. pp. 748, 12mo. *Paris.*

P. 294 Marques de la Predestinatim d'une ame Chrestienne.

——— **Civilis** (Grat.) Remonstrantium in Belgio Semi-Pelagianismus per Grotium in suâ pietate defensus. 8vo. *Bas.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

Another Ed., same place, 1618, 8vo. An Arminian work.

——— **Larenus** (Jod.) Responsio ad Jac. Arminii Analysis in 9 ad Romanos. 8vo. *Medioburg.*

Not mentioned by Lipenius, but he mentions 2nd Ed., *Helmst.*, 1618, 8vo.

1616. **Crocius** (Lud.) De Perseverantia Sanctorum, libri 7 in quibus, de Prædestinatione, libero arbitrio, de contra Pet. Bertium de Sanctorum apostasia disseritur. 12mo. *Brema.*

Another Ed., 1622, at *Gen.*, in 1625, 8vo; see as to this work Walch, ii., 453.

——— **Kellison** (Matthew) Examen Reformationis novæ præsertim Calvinianæ in quo synagoga et Doctrina Calvini, sicut et reliquorum hujus temporis novatorum, *etc.* refutantur. 8vo. *Duaci.*

Kellison was President of the English College at Douay.

——— **Cassander** (Geo.) Opera quæ reperiri potuerunt omnia Epistolæ cxvii., et colloquia ii. cum Anabaptistis, nunc primum edita. fol. *Par.*

P. 614. Honorii Augustodunensis ecclesiæ presbyteri de prædestinatione et libero arbitrio dialogus, epistolæ ii., una Prosperi, altera Hilarii Arelatensis Episcopi de reliquiis Pelagianæ hæreseos.

——— Jesuitica per Unitas Belgii provincias negociatio, edita jussu Deputatorum ordinum Frisiæ, 4to. *Franck.*

——— **Abbot** (Robt.) Explicatio VI. Illustrium quæstionum de mendacio, circumcisione, etc., An Deus sit auctor peccati. 4to. *Francof.*

——— **Weberus** (Joh.) Lampadius nescius, hoc est, Renovata Confutatio Prodromi, quem Jo. Lampadius censuræ subsidium ubiquitatis et specialiter Dogmatis de Prædestinatione emisit, sed prætensa Ignorantia hactenus scire noluit. 4to. *Giessæ.*

The Author was a Lutheran; also Author of "Anti-Lampadius," *Giessæ*, 1617, 4to.

——— **Bertius** (Pet.) Scripta adversaria Collationis Hagiensis habita MDCXI. de Divina Prædestinatione et capitibus ei adnexis, etc. 4to. *Lug. Bat.*

Not in Brit. Mus.

Appendix; *Ebena*, 1617, 4to; "Continentur illis celebres quinque articuli, quibus remonstrantes de quibusdam fidei capitibus, de prædestinatione videlicet, merito Christi, libero arbitrio, gratia ac fide, mentem suam declararunt, istique uberius explicati, confirmati ac defensi exhibentur."—*Walch*, i., 428.

——— **Rivet** (Andr., D.D.) Le Catholique Orthodoxe opposé au Catholique Papiste. 4to. *Saumur.*

Tr. iv., qu. 4 (Reprobation). Other Ed., *Lug. Bat.*, 1630, 2 vols; *Gen.*, 1644, fol., Opera Theologica, *Roterod.*, 1651—60, 3 vols, fol.

Rivet is called by a great divine "A man beyond all praise, and the most burning and shining light of the French and Dutch Churches." He was a Calvinist minister in Poitou, and brother-in-law of the Elder Peter du Moulin.

——— **Hutterus** (Leonh.) Irenicum vere christianum. pp. 26 and 275, 4to. *Witteb.*

Another Ed., same place, 1618.

1616. **Alstedius** (Joh. Hen.) Theologia Catechetica.

Section 3, c. 12, on original sin. The Author was Prof. of Philosophy and Divinity at Herborn, died 1638.

——— **Taufrerus** (Jo.) Disputationes Theologicæ apologeticæ de absoluto reprobationis decreto oppositæ Joh. Piscatori. 4to. *Argent.*

The same with other Disputations against the Decree of absolute reprobation; same place, 1617. 4to.

——— Porta Cœli et Scala Jacobi. 8vo. *Colon.*

(Roman).

——— **Sandæus** (Max.) Opusculum Theologicum de omni præsentia essentiali Dei, facta hoc tempore litigiosa inter Calvinistas Hollandiæ. 12mo. *Herbipoli.*

The Author was a learned Jesuit; died 1656.

——— **Pictet** (Benedict) Theologia Christiana. 2 vols, 12mo. *Gen.*

(Providence and Election). Another Ed., 1734, 2 vols, 12mo; 1820, 8vo; in French, *Gen.*, 1721, 3 vols, 4to; in English, *Lond.*, 1847, sm. 8vo.

This is an able Calvinistic work.

——— **Major** (John) Disputatio de Prædestinatione. 4to. *Jenæ.*

The Author was a Lutheran.

——— Tafel begrijfende ...het ..verschil ...tusschen...de leere...die in de...gereformeerde Kercken van Vranckrijc, &c., gheleert...coordt, ende de Leere van de ...Remonstranten en Arminianen, *etc.*, 4to.

——— **Sopingius** (God.) Responsio apologetica ad Libellum anonymi, qui vocatur: Bona fides Sibr. Lubberti et ad Hug. Grotii Pietatem. 4to. *Francof.*

Arminianism. Also at *Amsted.*, same year and size. The Author also wrote "Christiana et Modesta Declaratio, etc.," *Amst.*, 1616, 4to.

——— —**Ziegenhorus** (Mich.) Qq. tres de Baptismate. 4to. *Haliæ.*

The 2nd is "Utrum in Baptismo pauci tantum, absoluto Dei Decreto, ad vitam æternam ordinati, gratiam spiritus S. accipiant?

——— **Fabronius** (Herm.) Seraphina Fides Christianorum. 4to. *Schmaltalden.*

A German work, on the knowledge of God

——— **Sachsius** (Car.) Disquisitio de Attributis Dei essentialibus infinitis ac increatis, nulli creaturæ finitæ creatæ participative communicatis. 4to. *Francof.*

——— **Hilarii**, Episc. Prelat., Epist. ad Augustinum, de reliquiis Pelagianismi, cum Scholiis Cassandri. *Paris.*

1616. Exceptæ ex Augustino Sententiæ, de Prædestinatione, et Perseveratione cum Scholiis Cassandri. *Paris.*

——— **Curio** (C. Sec.) De Amplitudine Regni Cœlestis libri duo, quibus Numerum Electorum, s. salvandorum in Regno Cœlesti multo majorem futurum, quam Reproborum, &c. 12mo. *Franc.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Goodman** (Godfrey) The Fall of Man; or, the Corruption of Nature, proved by the light of our natural reason. 4to. *Lond.*

Other Eds., *Lond.*, 1618, 1629, 4to. Lipenius mentions an Ed., *Lond.*, 1624, but it is probably a misprint for 1629.

The Author was Bishop of Gloucester in 1625. He was suspended by Laud in 1639, and afterwards became a Roman Catholic. He published animad. on Hakewill on Providence, without date.

——— **Goulart** (Sim.) Traité de la grace de dieu envers les hommes et de l'eternelle élection des fideles, et reprobation des infideles. 8vo. *Amst.*

This was replied to by Jean Carlier Cafatier. *Amst.*, 1617, 12mo.

——— **Herberts** (H.) Cort ende claer bewijs uyt de H. Schriftuyr van 't ghevoelen der ghereformeerde leeraren, die ...Remonstranten genoemt worden, aengaende de Godlijcke Predestinatie. 8vo. *Goudæ.*

Against Election. Another Ed., *Roter.*, 1647, 8vo.

——— **Poppius** (Edward) August. Port. aut conciones in aliquos egregios textus; aut sententias sacræ scripturæ. 4to. *Goudæ.*

——— **Sylvius** (Franc.) Liber sententiarum de statu hominis post peccatum. 2nd Ed. 8vo. *Duaci.*

Another Ed., *Duaci.*, 1624, 1674, 8vo; and 1679, 12mo.

No Ed. in Brit. Mus.

——— **Gualtherus** (Marcus) Temeritas recalcitrans, sive dialogus inter sanam rationem et stultam temeritatem, de carentia liberi arbitrii primorum parentium, ante lapsum, &c. 4to. *Goudæ.*

Another Ed., *Francof.*, 1636, 4to.

——— **Dunganus** (Corn.) Thesium D. Junii de divina prædestinatione, ab ipso positarum et à Guilielmo Coddœs 1593 publice disputatarum, vera repetitio; et eorum quæ ad easdem D. Arminius breviter annotavit, in iisque desideravit, episcepsis seu compendiaria observatio data a C. D. 4to. *Amstel.*

Another Ed., *Amstel.*, 1617, 4to.

Neither Ed. in the Brit. Mus.

1616. **Thomson** (Rich.) Diatriba de amissione et intercisione gratiæ et justificationis. 8vo. *Lug. Bat.*
Another Ed., same place, 1618, 8vo: 1646, 1648, 4o.

——— **Schubartus** or **Schuberten** (Andr.) Lehre und Erklärung der Artickels, von der Vorsehung Gottes. 4to. *Leipz.*

1617. **Amesius** (Guil.) G. Amesii ad Responsum N. Grevinchovii Rescriptio contracta, Accedunt ejusdem assertationes Theologicæ de Lumine Naturæ et Gratiæ. 12mo. *Lug. Bat.*

——— **Johnson** (Fran.) A Christian Plea, conteyning three Treatises, the first touching the anabaptists ..... The second touching such Christians as now are here commonly called Remonstrants or Arminians. The third touching the Reformed Churches, &c. 4to. [*Amst.*]
The Author was a Brownist.

——— **Carleton** (Sir Dudley) Harangue fait au conseile de Messrs. les Estats Généraux des Provinces Unies touchant le Discord et les Troubles de l'Eglise et la Police causés par la doctrine d'Armenius. 4to.
Published in English, being set forth by authority, *Lond.*, 1618, 4to. Carleton was an eminent statesman and the last English Minister who had the honour of sitting in the council of state for the United Provinces.
The original of 1617 is not in the Brit. Mus.

——— Secunda Remonstrantio Ministrorum Ecclesiarum Hollandicarum et West Frisicarum qui Remonstrantes vocantur. Illust. D. D. Ordinibus Hollandiæ et West-Frisiæ tradita in Aprili Anno 1617, cum secunda Remonstrantio, seu Responsione ad eam Reformatorum earundem Ecclesiarum Ministrorum, in qua demonstratur Remonstrantes Novam Doctrinam in Ecclesias Reformatas introducere iisdem Illust. D. D. Ordinibus tradita in Augusto Anno 1615. 4to. *Lugd. Bat.*

——— **Du Moulin** (Pet.) De la juste Providence de Dieu; Traité auquel est examiné un écrit du sieur Arnoux, par lequel il prétend prouver que Calvin fait Dieu auteur du péché. 8vo. *La Rochelle.*
In reply to a work in 7 Articles, of P. Arnoux, the Jesuit.
The Author was a native of Paris who settled in this country and became Preb. of Canterbury. A. Wood calls him an honest and zealous Calvinist, and says that the last words he uttered were: "Since Calvinism is cried down, actum est de religione Christi apud Anglos."
Author of "Tractatus de Cognitione Dei," *Lug. Bat.*, 1625, pp, 144, 32mo; a valuable little book of which there was another Ed., *Leidæ*, 24mo.

1617. **Dent** (Arthur) The Opening of Heaven's Gates; or, the ready way to everlasting life. Delivered in a most familiar dialogue between Reason and Religion touching Prædestination. B.L., 4th Ed., 12mo. *Lond.*

——— **Vorstius** (Conr.) Amica duplicatio ad Piscatoris apologeticam responsionem et notas ejusdem, amicæ collationi oppositas, parte prima. 4to. *Goudæ.*
Replied to by Piscator in 1618, *Herb.*, 4to. See as to this discussion, *Walch*, ii., 452.

——— **Ravoire** (Paul de la) Remonstrance à Mm. les Etats de Hollande. 4to. *Leyde.*

——— **Duncan** (Conr.) Vera Repetitio Thesium D. Junii de Divina Prædestinatione. 4to. *Amst.*

——— **Salkeld** (John) Treatise of Paradise, &c. sm. 8vo.
(Good and Evil, the Fall, &c.) Scarce.

——— Acta...des Nationalen Synodi der Neder-landtschen Duytschen ende Walschen Kerchen...gehouden tot Dordrecht. Beginnen den 2 Junij et Anno 1578.

——— Remonstrantium Responsio ad Epistolam ministrorum Walckiensium. 4to. *Lugd.*

——— Acta...des Provincialen Synodi der Kerchen van Hollandt ende Zeelant ghehouden binnen Dordrecht den 16 Junij, et 1574.

——— **Grevinchovius** (N.) Apologia publica et privata, &c. pp. xii., 180, 4to. *Roterod.*
(Predestination, providence, grace and freewill).
Another Ed., *Arnh.*, 1618, 4to.

——— Epistola Ecclesiastarum, quos in Belgio Remonstrantes vocant ad exterarum Ecclesiarum doctores, &c. pp. ii., 133, 4to. *Lugd. Bat.*
(Predestination).
"Epistola hæc opposita est litteris, quas delegati classis valachrianæ ad eosdem doctores dederant atque ex iis exquisiverant sententiam de quinque articulis remonstrantium; ne autem hi condemnarentur, antequam caussa eorum rite ac satis cognita esset, adductam epistolam itidem ad reformatos doctores; immo et ad quosvis, veritatis ac pacis ecclesiasticæ cupidos, exararunt."—*Walch*, *i.*, 429.

[1617]. **Paget** (Eusebius) A Sermon upon Election. *Gen.*, XXV., 23. *Lond.*
The Author was a Puritan Rector of St. Anne and St, Agnes, *Lond.*

1617. **Guymard** (J.) L'Accord de la predestination avec la franc arbitre. 4to. *Par.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Barlæus** or **Baarle** (Caspar) Epistola ecclesiastarum, quos in Belgio remonstrantes vocant, &c. 4to. *Lugd. Bat.*

——— **Grevinchovius** (Nicol.) Dissert. de variis novitatibus caussa prædestinationis.

1617 **Amesius** (Guil.) Rescript. Scholast. et brev. ad Nic. Greviuchovii responsum illud prolixum, quod opposuit dissertationi de redemptione generali et electione ex fide prævisa. 12mo. *Lug. Bat.*
See Walch, ii., 548, 549.

——— **Bucelianus** (Aug.) Opuscula insigniora adversus Pelagianos. 4to. *Lovan.*

——— **Latius** (Jo.) Comment. ex veterum patrum scriptis de Pelagianis et Semi-Pelagianis. 4to. *Hardu.*
See also *Antiqua ecclesiæ ac reipublicæ in Pelagianum hæresin decreta, breviter elucidata scholiis chronologicis* a CHRISTIANO LUPO in ejus *bibliotheca historiæ hæresiolog.*, tom. ii., fascicul. i., p. 37, and his *Varia Scripta et monimenta, ad Pelagianorum historiam pertinentia* to be found in his Versuch einer unpartheyischen und gründlichen hetzergeschichte., part I. *Helmstadii*, 1746, 4to. Jo. Garnerii dissertationis VII. quibus integra continetur historia Pelagiana in Marii Mercatoris operibus, pt. I.; Jo. Cabassuttii hæresis Pelagianæ et semipelagianæ historica et Theologica delineatio (in notit. Ecclesiastic.).

——— **Smout** (A. G.) Nicolaus Grevinchovius Heautontimorumenos. 4to. *Amst.*

——— **Paræus** (Dav.) Theses Theologicæ de libero arbitrio hominis et gratia Dei; præside D. P. 4to. *Heidelb.*

——— Appendix pressioris declarationis, continens testimonia quibus demonstratur Remonstrantes in proponendis doctrinæ, quam rejiciunt, capitibus, non ambulasse mala fide. 4to. *Lug. Bat.*

——— **Meisnerus** (Balth.) Decas Anthropologiæ sacræ de Gratia Dei et Prædestinatione. *Witteb.*

——— **Winckelmannus** (Joh.) Disp. Theol. contra errores Calvinianorum de ...electione. 4to. *Giessæ.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Hall** (Joseph, *D.D.*) Via Media: The Way of Peace, in the five busy Articles.
See 1624.

——— **[Niellius].**—Noodighe Antwordt op der Contra Remonstranten Tegenvertooch...met vast bewijs dat de Leere der Remonstranten...niet Nieu...is, &c. 4to. *'s Hage.*

——— **Conferentie** (Schriftelijcke) gehouden in 's Gravenhaghe in 1611, tusschen sommighe Kerchen-dienaren aengaende de Godlicke Predestinatie metten aencleve van dien. pp. 440, 4to. *'s Hage.*

——— **Herberts** (H.) Christel. verdedigingh ende breeder bewijs...aengaende de Predestinatie, op 't Teghenbericht J. Revii. 8vo. *Gouda.*

1618. **Schulwinus** (Joh.) Tractatus Theol. de Dicto apost. Rom. V. ver. 12 in quo agitur de Peccato originis. 8vo. *Giessæ.*

1618. **Havenreuterus** (Ludovic.) De Causis per accident Fortuna et Casu. 4to.

——— **Episcopius** (Sim.) Collegium Disputationum Theologicarum in Academia Leydensi privatim institutarum. pp. x., 100, 4to. *Dordrech.*

——— **Hommius** (Festus) Optima fides F. H. cujus specimen in citatione insignium locorum ex Thesibus privatis S. Episcopii . . . . demonstratur ex libro quem inscripsit specimen controversiarum Belgicarum. 4to. *Lugd.*

——— ——— Confessio Reformatorum in Belgio, cum Articulis discrepantibus. Addita Harmonia Synodorum Belgicarum. 4to. *Lugd.*

——— ——— Quel-Geest, vervætende ...vragen aen de Contra Remonstranten ...om daer op te hebben ..antwoort, conform t' ghevoelen, dat in desen ghehadt..... hebben die Theologanten, welcke sy in haer Tagen-Vertooch [chiefly by F. H., etc.]...verclaeren, dat se haer ghevoelen van de Prædestinatie opentlijck gheleert...hebben, etc. 4to. [*Dort*].

——— ——— Collegium disputationum theologicarum...addita est præfatio in quâ demonstratur, in utendis hisce Thesibus...optima fides, F. H. 4to.

——— **Gennadius** Schol. Patr. Const. Epistola apologetica pro S. Basilio Magno, ejusque assertione de prædestinatione Latine, ex versione et cum notis Federici Morelli. 8vo. *Paris.*
See 1594.

——— **Meisnerus** (Balth.) Disputatio de Prædestinatione æterna. 4to. *Witteb.*

——— **Gonterus** (J.) Tract. de Præsentia Dei. 8vo. *Col.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Hommius** (Festus) Specimen controversiarum Belgicarum. 4to. *Lug. Bat.*
Walch i., 411.

——— **Socinus** (F.) Explicatio primæ partis primi capitis Johannis; adjectæ sunt cap. 9 Epist. ad Rom. et aliorum quorundam S. Scripturæ locorum. 8vo. *Racoviæ.*

——— **Martinius** (Matth.) De Fœderis Naturæ et Gratiæ Signaculis. 8vo. *Bremæ.*

——— **Robertus** (Episc. Sariburiensis) De gratia et Perseverantia Sanctorum 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Sandæus** (Max.) Hydrus Hollandicus. 8vo. *Herbip.*

——— **Bradwardine** (Thos.) De Causa

Dei contra Pelagium, opera H. Savilii. fol. *Lond.*

Another Ed., 1624.

The Author was confessor to Edw. III., and was surnamed "The Profound Doctor." He was Archbishop of Canterbury, 1349, and died a few weeks after his consecration. He was of Merton Coll., Oxford, and one of the Proctors of that University in 1325. His work "De Causa Dei," was edited by Sir H. Saville, at the instance of Archb. Abbot. Bradwardine was reckoned to be one of the closest reasoners of his age, and in the above work 'his known mathematical mind applied demonstrations founded upon previous admitted convictions.' He has been accused of holding in this work, the same doctrine which has since been called Protestantism. "It is a surprising work for the age in which it appeared."—*Bickersteth.*

1618. **Cameron** (Joh.) Theses de gratia et Libero Arbitrio. 8vo. *Salmur.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

This work appears also in the Author's collected works, *Gen.*, 1658, fol., p. 310. He was a Scotch minister of great learning, and Prof. of Greek in Univ. of Glasgow at the age of 20 years. He afterwards taught Latin, Greek and Divinity at Bordeaux, Sedan, Saumur, and Montauban. Bishop Hall pronounced him to be the most learned man Scotland ever produced,—a rather extravagant statement. He d. 1625, see 1621.

——— **Bayne** (Paul) A Commentary on the 1st Chapter of the Ephesians, handling the controversy of Predestination. 4to. *Lond.*

Lowndes does not mention this edition, but one in 1643 only, which was really the commentary on the whole Epistle, and of which another Ed., 1658, fol.

——— De namen der...Staten Generael Ghecommitteesden soo wel uytheemsche als in—landtsche Theologanten .....tot desen nationael Synodus te honden, gesenden binnen Dordrecht, Anno 1618. *Leyden.*

——— **Barlow** (John) Sermon on Rom. VIII., 28. 4to. *Lond.*

Not in the Brit Mus.

——— **Amesius** (Guil.) Tractatus de Prædestinatione. *Lug. Bat.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Piscator** (Joh.) Examen de Divina prædestinatione. 4to. *Goudæ.*

——— **Vorstius** (Conr.) Examen Tract. Joh. Piscatoris de Prædestinatione. 4to. *Goudæ.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

This Ed. not mentioned by Lipenius. Another Ed., same place, 1619, 4to.

——— **Piscator** (Joh.) Responsio ad Amicam duplicationem Conr. Vorstii de Prædestinatione. 4to. *Herber.*

——— **Uytenbogardus** (Joan.) Responsio ad ea quæ illi speciatim impegit Festus Hommius de controversiis Belgicis. 4to. *Lug. Bat.*

Another Ed., same place, 1619, 4to. Ed. Lipenius Bibl. Real. Theol. i., 97.

1618. **Vossius** (Ger. Joh.) Historiæ de Controversiis quas Pelagius ejusque Reliquiæ moverunt. 4to. *Lug. Bat.*

Another Ed.. *Amst. Elziv.*, 1655, 4to, pp. 830. Also in the 6th vol of his works, *Amst.*, 1701, 6 vols, folio, in which vol. will also be found, p. 356, his Tracts, "De peccato primo Adami," and p. 470, "De hæresi Pelagii de peccato originali." Vossius was a learned and laborious writer, director of the College of Dort. He subsequently became Prof. at Leyden, and in 1633, Prof. of history at Amsterdam. d. 1649. Coming to England in 1629 there were conferred upon him, the degree of Dr. in the University of Oxford, and a prebendal stall at Canterbury.

The above work is one of great research and learning, and a valuable contribution to the literature of the Pelagian controversy.

——— **Hoe** (Matt.) Tract. Anti-Calvinisticus contra W. Budowetz. 4to. *Leipz.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Abbot** (Robert, *D.D.*, Bishp. of Salisbury) Exercitationes de Gratia et Perseverantia Sanctorum. 8vo. *Lond.*

The Author was Master of Baliol, 1609; Preb. of Normanton, Regius Prof. of Divinity at Oxford in 1612, d. 2nd March, 1617. Abbot also wrote "In Ricardi Thomsoni, Angli-Belgici, Diatribam, de amissione et intercessione Justificationis et Gratiæ, animadversio brevis," *Lond.*, 1618, 4to. This work he finished the last day of his life, and then his brother, the Archbishop, directed Dr. Featley, the bishop's domestic chaplain, to draw up from his Grace's notes the attestation which is fixed to it.

The Author was a Sublapsarian.

——— **Argumenta** Pastorum Hollandiæ adversus Remonstrantium quinque articulos de Prædestinatione. *Lug. Bat.*

——— **Amesius** (Guil.) Coronis ad Collationem Hagiensem quâ argumenta Pastorum Hollandiæ adversus Remonstrantium quinque articulos de divina prædestinatione vindicantur. *Lug. Bat.*

Other Ed., *Amst.*, 1628, 1630, 1634, 12mo. Lipenius mentions an Ed. *Lug. Bat.*, 1617, 4to. See Bibl. Real. Theol. i., 335.

——— Responsio ad Contra-Remonstrantium Contrariam Declarationem. 4to. *Lug. Bat.*

Lipenius has this dated 1678, but this is probably an error.

——— The names of the Persons assembled in the Synode of Dort. 4to. *Lond.*

——— Gelderland, States of—A Proclamation given by the discreet Lords and States against the slanders laid upon the Evangelicall and Reformed Religion, by the Arminians and Separatists, &c. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Theodotus** (Salm.) [Afhacker (Aeg.)] ἑνωτικὸν, sive Pacificatorium, dissecti Belgii, *etc.* 8vo. *Ursellis.*

1618. **Vorstius** (Adol.) Apologetica Responsio ad ea quæ Festus Hommius ipsi impegit in libro controversiarum Belgicarum. 4to. *Goudæ.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

Not mentioned by Lipenius. Another Ed., *Lug. Bat.*, 1619, 4to.

——— Balance pour poser en toute equité et droicture la harangue que Dudley Carleton, Ambassadeur du Roy de la Grande Bretagne, a faite en l'assemblée des Estats generaux des Provinces Unies des Pays-bas, &c. 4to.

——— **Heurnius** (Justus) De legatione Evangelica ad Judæos, seu de vocatione Ethnicorum et Judæorum ad Fidem Christianam. 4to. *Lugd. Bat.*

——— **Wollebius** (Andr.) Rob. Bellarminus de lapsu Adami, Peccato originis, Prædestinatione, gratia, et libero arbitrio refutatus. 8vo. *Lug. Bat.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

Wollebius also wrote "Synopsis Papismi, Controversia tertia generalis de Conciliis, Disputatio erudita, et illustris, imprimis adv. Bellarm. et alios Pontificios conscripta," *Oppenh.*, 1618, 8vo.

——— **Guymard** (J.) Réfutation du Traité de la juste Providence de Dien, de P. du Moulin, contre un écrit par luy faussement attributé au R. P. Arnoux. 8vo. *Paris.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Benefeild** (Sebastian, *D.D.*) Prælectiones de Perseverantia sanctorum. 8vo. *Francof.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

The author was Lady Margaret Prof. of Divinity, 1613, and Rector of Meysey-Hampton near Fairford, Gloucestershire. He was an eminent scholar, disputant and divine, and particularly well versed in the fathers and schoolmen. He was strongly attached to the views of Calvin on Predestination, and is termed by Humphrey Leigh "a downright and doctrinal Calvinist." He d. 1630.

——— Dissertationes duæ, prima de reconciliatione per mortem Christi impetrata omnibus ac singulis hominibus, altera de electione ex fide prævisa. *Roter.*

——— Arminian Score—a Dutch publication in verse. 4to. [*Amst*].

——— Arminian tormenting spirit. 4to. *Amst.*

——— Nieuwe ty dinghe hoe de Arminianen teghen de Reformeerde Leeraers Christelijcker Kerche hebben eenighe schimpe . gemaect, etc. 4to. *Francker.*

In answer to a pamphlet entitled:—Der Contraremonstrantem Kerfstock, &c.

1618. Responsio necessaria ad Contra-Remonstrantium declarationem. 2 tom. 4to. *Lug. Bat.*

1619. **Bayne** (Paul) The Mirror, or Miracle of God's love unto the World of his Elect. A sermon on John iii, 16. 4to. *Lond.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Weberus** (Joh.) Calvinische Brunnquell, darinn die *Consequenzen*, welche aus der leidigen und blosen Wahl, &c. 4to. *Leip.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— ——— Quæst. utrum Prædestinatio ad Vitam æternam sit universalis an particularis? contra Joh. Keckium. 4to. *Giessæ.*

——— [**Baarle K. van**] Verroogh [*sic*] ende supplicatie, in Druck uyt laten gaen. 4to.

——— Vertoogh ly de Remonstranten ghedaputeest op het Synod Nationnael tot Dordrecht, aff ghesonden .. . den 26 Jan., 1619, aen de Staten Generael, *etc.* 4to. [*The Hague*].

——— [**Baarle K. van**] Vertroostinghe aen de remonstrantsche kercken. over het...bonnissement van hare...predicanten, op het nationael synode gheeiteert. 4to.

——— Request aende...Staten Generael der Vereenich de Provintien van weghen de Remonstranten...gedapen teerde tot den Synodum Nationael brunen Dordrecht (verroeckende dat de selve gelieve de supplianten van arrest te ontslaan). *Rotterdam.*

——— **Slatius** (H.) Den Ghepredestineerden Dief ofte een t'samensprekinge (*sic*) ghehouden tusschen een predicant der Calvinus ghesinde ende een Dief. 4to. *S.L.*

Antwoord op den gepredestineerden of renkeloosen dief, S.L., 1717, 12mo. See 1651 Sancroft. The above tract is excessively rare.

——— **Methodius**. Tractatus de Libero Arbitrio, Græce editus per Meursium.

——— **Crellius** (Joh.) Bericht von der Gnadenwahl Gottes, und Gewissen Kennzeichen der Auserwählten Gottes. *Cassel.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

His best known work is "De Deo et ejus attributis," *Racov.*, 1630, 4to.

——— Een cort verhael van die principaelste puncten die in Hollandt tot D. in die Synode ghetrackteert worden, ghestelt in Rijme. Tot confusie van die selve Synode...gemaect door een Liefhebber der C.A.R.R. 4to. [*Antwerp*].

Anti-Calvinist.

——— [**Episcopius** (Sim.)] Antidotum ende naerder openinghe van het eyghene ghevoden des Nationalen Synodi, ghe

honden binnen Dordrecht annis 1615 en 1619, tot onderrechtinge...der ghener die de Canones van het selfde...lesen... voorloopers wijse ghestelt. 4to. [*Antwerp*].

1619. Verhael van einen gepredestineerden Cappuyn. 4to. *Antv.*

——— **Feurbornius** (Just.) Fasciculus, Disp. Theologicarum. 8vo. *Giessæ.*

2nd Diss. VI.

Feurborn was also the author of "De Natura et Gratia," etc., and of Dissertations on election and calling to salvation and eternal life, and one on the reprobation of unbelievers. These will be found in his collected works.

——— **Paræus** (Dav.) Oratio de Synodo Nationali Dordracenâ, *Heidelb.*

——— **Bourgeois** (Jean) Libri tres de continentia christiana adversus, Epicuræos hujus temporis, impios Lutheri et Calvini asseclas, quibus adjunctus est Lælius emendatus, sive de Amicitia Christiana. 4to. *Duaci.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

Another Ed., at same place in 1638, 4to. The Author was a Jesuit.

——— **Lechner** (Gaspar) Digitus Dei in bivio sive Tractatus de Providentia Dei circa distributionem statutum. 12mo. pp. 25. *Ingolst.*

Another Ed., *Ingolst*, 1620, 12mo. The Author was a Jesuit, who died at Prague, in 1634.

——— **Martinius** (Matth.) Lex divina Naturæ, Gratiæ et Politiæ. 8vo. *Bremæ.*

——— Corte Verclaringhe vande vyf Artyckelen, daer over tusschen de Remonstranten ende Contra-Remonstranten, ghedisputeert wort. 4to.

——— [**Episcopius** (Sim.)] Corte ont deckinghe vande Bedrieghelijckheydt des Dortschen Synodi in 't smeden van seeckere Artijckelen van...Verdæg saemkeyt tusschen den Remonstranten ende Contra-Remonstranten ende synhier noch bygevoeght 34 Artijckelen vervattinde tgevoclen der Remonstranten (no pende de Goddelijcke Prædestinatie). &c. 4to. [*Amsterdam?*]

——— [**Episcopius** (Sim.) or **Dwingle** (B.)] Nulliteyten, Mishandelingen, ende oubillijche Proceduren des Nationalen Synodi, ghebonden brumen Dordrecht anno 1618—1619 in 't korte ende rouwe afgheworpen, etc. 4to. [*Eukhuizen*].

——— [**Episcopius** (Sim.)] Onbillijcke wreetheyt der Dortsche Synode...teghen de Remonstranten, etc. 4to. [*Leyden*].

——— **Becanus** (Mart.) Theologiæ Scholasticæ Pars secunda. Vol. 1. pp. 425. 4to. *Mogunt.*

(De Actibus humanis, de Peccato, de Legibus, de Gratia).

There was another Edition of this vol. *Duaci*, 1627 in 8vo, pp. 520.

1619. **Hommius** (F.) Oordeel d. Synodi Nationalis v. Dordrecht in 1618—19, over de vijf hooftstuchen der leere. 4to. *Dordr.*

——— **Zeæmannus** (Geo.) Controversia difficillima de Imagine Dei in primo homine, statuque innocentiæ; item de paradiso, arbore vitæ, arbore scientiæ boni et mali et cognatis arduis quæstionibus. 4to. *Campidoni.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

Another Ed., *Augustæ*, 1620, 4to.

Other works, De Imagine Dei not mentioned in this list:—Deutschmann (Joh.) *Witteb.*, 1671, 4to; Ducatius (Tim.) *Genev.*, 1625, 8vo; Flacius (M.) *Basil.*, 1568; Irenæus (Christ.) *Ursel.*, 1584, 4to, in German; Lastius (Christ.) *Leipz.*, 1565, in German; Meyer (Joh. Nic.) *Giessæ*, 1662, 4to; Payugk (Ferd.) *Rostoch.*, 4to; Wigandus (John) *Jenæ*, 1573. 8vo; Willemer, (J. H.) *Witteb.*, 1678, 4to.

——— Proclamation of the States of Holland against disputes concerning the V Points of Predestination. 4to. *Lond.*

——— Der Remonstranten Kirchgang. 4to.

——— **Barichius** (Mart.) Prodromus, seu Tract. Anti-Calvinisticus, contra M. Hoe. *Han.*

Not in Brit. Mus.

——— **Molinus or Du Moulin** (Pet.) Anatome Arminianismi. 4to. *Lugd. Bat.*

Other Ed. same place, 1620, 1621, 4to; in English, *Lond.*, 1620, 4to; 1635, 18mo. The copy of 1620 in the British Museum has copious MS. notes. See Lilienthal Theol. Bibl., vol 1, p. 871; Koecher, Bibl. Theol. Symbol., p. 497; Walch, ii, p. 546. The work was answered by Corvinus in 1621, and trans. into Eng., 1620, which see. This same year Molinus wrote "Judicium de libro Amyraldi contra Spanhemium," *Roterd.*, 8vo.

——— Acta Synodalia Dordracena ministrorum Remonstrantium in Fœderato Belgio. *Herder. Viici.*

——— Acta Synodalia Nationalis Habita anno 1618—19; accedunt plenissima Judicia de quinque articulis Theologorum. *Dordrech.*

Also *Hanov.*, 4to; *Lug. Bat. et Francof.*, 1619, 4to; *Lug. Bat.*, 1620, fol.; *Amst.*, 1620, 4to; *Hag.*, 1668, 4to; in Dutch, *Dordr.*, 1621, 4to; in French, *Dordr.*, 1624, 4to. Acta hæc colligendi atque evulgandi, provincia commissa esse traditur Joanni Polyandro, Antonio Walæo, Antonio Thysio, Danieli Heinsio, Festo Hommio, Danieli Colonio, Jo. Latio eos tamen interdum debitam fidem ac diligentiam neglexisse eruditissimi viri animadverterunt. Præfatio horum actorum Danieli Heinsio, tamquam auctori, tribuitur. Exierunt quoque in lucem; *post-acta* synodi dordracenæ, *Hagæ*, 1618, 4to; ubi enarrantur, quæ a theologis batavis Dordrechti sex ac viginti sessionibus peracta sunt, postquam exteri discesserant, Walch iii, 849.

——— **Malderus** (Jo.) Anti-Synodica, seu Animadversiones in Decreta Synodi nationalis Dordracenæ, de 5 capitibus controversis inter Remonstrantes et Contra Remonstrantes. *Ant.*

1619. Judgment of the Synode of Dort concerning the 5 Articles and their Sentence concerning Conr. Vorstius and his doctrine in the year 1618—19. 4to. *Lond.*

Same in Latin, *Dort.*, 1619; *Heidel.*, 1619, 8vo.

——— Judicium Synodi Nationalis Reformatarum Ecclesiarum Belgicarum habitæ Dordrechti anno 1618 et 1619, de quinque Doctrinæ capitibus controversis. 4to. *Dordrechti.*

Another ed., *Heydelbergæ*, 1619, 4to. Another Ed. [*The Hague*, ? 1619] 4to.

——— [Neomagus A.] ' Themelsch Synodus ende rechtmatigh oordeel gehonden tot Zion teghen 't Aerdsche Synodus Nationael ende ourechtveerdich oordeel ghehonden binnen Dordrecht in ae Dool-Cappelle anno 1618 ende 1619. 4to. [*Antwerp.*]

——— Oordeel des nationalen Synodi van Dordrecht over de Theologie ofte Leere C. Vorstij ... mitsgaders de Resolutie vande Staten van Holland.....daer opghevolght. 4to. *s' Graven-Haghe*

——— **Guild** (Wm., *D.D.*) The harmony of all the prophets concerning Christ's coming, and the Redemption he was to accomplish. 8vo. *London.*

Another Ed., 1658, 12mo.

———**Gallus** (Liborius) Der bericht vom streit der remonstranten und contra remonstranten. 4to. *Muhlh.*

——— **Fraxinus** (Liber.) Specimen notarum in loca quædam Jac. Arminii et Jo. Arnoldi, quorum errores refutantur. 4to. *Amst.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— Die Calvinische Predestinatie, tusschen eenen Gommarist ende Arminiæn. 4to. *Antwerp.*

A Dialogue in verse, printed in the Gazette of Antwerp. The copy in the Brit. Mus. wants the title page.

——— Sommier verhael van de wreede handelinghe der Bloet dorstighe Calvinisten ghepleeght teghen de Remonstranten buyten Rotterdam op den XX. October. 4to. *Antwerp and* [*The Hague*].

——— **Sandæus** (Max.) De Prædestinatione, reprobatione, etc., Synodo apud Hollandos controversis, libri ii. Pp. 490, 12. *Herbipoli.*

——— ——— Anacephalæosis Doctrinæ de Prædestinatione in quâ catholicorum, Gomaristarum, Arminianorumque, enunciata punctim recensentur, ut, in quo conveniunt, et dissidunt, clarè elucescat. Herbipoli, pro honore Theologico disputationi oblata, Præside Maximiliano Sandœo, etc. 8vo. pp. 61. *Wirceb.*

Another ed., *Herbip.*, 1639.

1619. L'iniquité du synode de Dordrecht, et de ceux qui en ont eu la conduite, contre ceux qu' on appelle Remonstrans. 4to.

——— Brief recit de la persecution emue en Hollande par les Gomaristes contre les Remonstrans. 4to.

——— **Roe** (Gul.) Epilogus colloquii Spandani: Domino D. Wright, Anglo, malæ causæ clienti et Jacobo Nixon, Hiberno, advocato pejori : et Gulielmo Stanleio, patrono pessimo : religionis et patriæ postibus : pænam seram et pœnitentiam seriam, G. R. exoptat. 4to. *Francof.*

——— **Sandæus** (Max.) Hydri Hollandici, lib. iii. de Prædestinatione et Reprobatione. 8vo. *Herbip.*

——— ——— Hydrus Hollandicus, *i.e.*, Controvers. Hollandicarum, lib. IV. 8vo. *Herbip.*

A Roman Catholic.

——— ———Summarischer Begriff der Lehre von der *Prædestination* und *Reprobation* des Menschen. 8vo. *Wurtz.*

Another Ed., *Colon.*, 1639.

——— Verhael hoe dat in Hollant binnen de stadt van Leyden, de Arminianen zijn verzaert geweest in een huys om te preken, op den 21 April, 1619, waer over de Gommaristen met het gran zijn gyecomen ende hedden depredicatie verstoordt het huys berooft ende geplundert ende den predicantis int water ghesponghen. Noch met het verhael vant Placcaet ghepubliceert binnen Rotterdam teghen d'Arminiaenen. 4to. *Antwerp.*

——— Verhael van den Oproer binnen Rotterdam in Hollant, hoe dat de Arminianen zijn vergaert geweest om te Preken op de Visch-marckt Sondach lest leden XXI Julij..... *etc.* 4to. *Antwerp.*

[1619]. 't Arminiaens Testament. Der Arminianer Testament und Inventaris dero nachgelassenen menbelen, etc. fol.

A Caricature.

[1619]. Der Arminianen troost. fol.

In Verse.

[1619]. Toneel der Arminianen. 4to. [*The Hague*].

In Verse.

1619. **Ferri** (Paul.) Vindiciæ pro Scholastico Orthodoxo Justæ, plenæ et amicæ, quibus multum de Natura et Justitia originali de Prædestinatione et reprobatione, de libero arbitrio et Gratia, causa peccati, etc., defenduntur et explicantur. 8vo. *Lug. Bat.*

Another ed., *Lugd. Bat.*, 1638, 8vo.

——— **Hugon** (Herm.) De vera Fide capessenda ad Synodum Dordracenam. 8vo. *Antv.*

1619. **Beyerlingk** (Lam.) Tract. Synodicus ad Synodum Dordracensem, de Synodorum Institutione, usu, causis, Firmitate, Auctoritate, prærogativa. 8vo. *Antv.*

1620. Arminian voyage.—a Dutch publication in Verse. 4to. *The Hague.*

——— **Pædopater** (Conr.) Unterricht von der Gnaden-Wahl. 8vo. *Muhlhausen.*

——— **Mentzerus** (Bath.) Disp. VI., VII., VIII. Anti-Steinianæ. *Giessæ.* (Lutheran).

——— **Neuwald** (Herm.) Predigten I. Von der Gnadenwahl und Vorsehung Gottes, etc. 4to. *Rostoch.*
The Author was a Lutheran.

——— Acta et Scripta Synodalia Dordracena Ministrorum Remonstrantium in fœderato Belgio. 2 vols, 4to. *Hardervici.*
This was published by the Remonstrants, written probably by Uytenbogarert, and contains, first their account of the proceedings, and then their sentiments on the doctrines.
As to this work, see Walch ii, 522, and iii, 849.
It is written in opposition to the Acta Synodi Nationalis, which see, 1619.
Another Ed., *Harderv.*, 1623, 4to.

——— **Tilenus** (Dan.) The Doctrine of the Synods of Dort and Alez reduced to practice.

——— **Hoe** (Matt.) Calvinistarum descriptio et assertio contra libellum Lud. Crocii. 4to. *Lips.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Malderus** (Jo.) Anti-Synodica, sive Animadversiones in Decreta conventus Dordraceni, quem vocant Synodum nationalem, de quinque Doctrinæ Capitibus inter Remonstrantes et Contra-Remonstrantes controversis. 8vo. *Antv.*
Malderus was Bishop of Antwerp. The work is very rare.

——— **Tilenus** (Dan.) Paræsis ad Scotos Genevensis Disciplinæ zelotas. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Gaudier** (Ant.) De Dei præsentia. 12mo. pp. 209. *Par.*
Another Ed., *Col. Agr.*, 1621, 1622, 8vo.
A Jesuit. Rector of the College of Leige, and Professor of Moral Theology at Pont-à-Mousson.
No Ed. in Brit. Mus.

——— De Prædestinatione, Præscientia, et Reprobatione. 4to. *Veronæ.*
(A Roman Catholic work.)

——— **Alvarez** (Did. de) De Auxiliis Divinæ Gratiæ et humani Arbitrii viribus et libertate ac legitima ejus cum efficacia eorundem auxiliorum concordia libri, &c. fol. *Lugd.*

1620. **Wilson** (Thomas) Saints by calling; or called to be Saints. A Godly Treatise of our holy calling to Christ by the Gospell. With the severall gifts proper unto the called, etc. 8vo. [*Lond*].
The Author was one of the six preachers in the Cathedral Church of Canterbury.

——— **Capellus** (Jac.) Theses Theologicæ de libero arbitrio; præside J. C. 4to. *Sedan.*

——— ——— Theses Theologicæ de prædestinatione; docentes electionem ex fide prævisa non esse; præside D. J. propugnatæ. 4to. *Sedan.*

——— Kerchen Ardeninghe, ghestelt in den Nationalen Synode der gherefor-meerde Kerchen ..... ghehonden door ordre van de Staten General der Vereenichde Nederlanden, binnen Dordrecht, inde Jaren 1618 ende 1619. 4to. *Arnhem.*

——— **Sandæus** (Max.) Considerationes de Synodi Dordrechtanæ emolumentis, 8vo. pp. 552. *Herbipoli.*
The Author was a Jesuit.

——— **Recupitus** (Jul. Ces.) Sacrarium de stupenda horrendaque Supplicorum apud Inferos Æternitate: itemque Sacrarium formidabile de Multitudine Reproborum et Electorum Paucitate. 12mo. *Colon.*
This work is ascribed to Recupitus by Rotermund in his Fortsetzung zu Jochers allgem. Gelehrten Lexiko, though not mentioned by De Bacher under his name. It seems to have been published anonymously. See Lipenius Bibl. Realis Theol., ii., 98.

——— A Description of what God hath predestinated concerning
Man in his { Creation, Transgression and Regeneration.
As also an answer to J. Robinson touching Baptisme. 8vo. *Lond.*
The Preface is signed: The Servants of Christ falsly called ana-baptists.

——— **Sigwartus** (Jo. Geo.) Tract. de libro vitæ. 4to. *Tub.*

——— **Thummius** (Theod.) Μισανθρωπία calvinistica. 4to. *Tub.*
Another Ed., 1621; *Franck.*
The Author was a Lutheran, and also wrote "Synopsis Doctrinæ de æterna Prædestinatione." *Tub.*

——— **Severus** (Christ.) Thesaurus incomparabilis. fol. *Coloniæ.*
A German work on the Fall.

——— **Battus** (Barth.) Vindiciæ Veritatis de possibilitate apostasias sanctorum, etc. 8vo. *Rostoch.*
Another Ed., *Gryph*, 1622, 8vo. See 1625.

1620. Certain death stabs of Calvinistic Predestination, with their effects.
pp. 124. 4to. *Harders-wijck.*
A rare Dutch Tract. The stabs are given by "one of the most famous teachers among the exiled Remonstrants whose name is not to be disclosed."

——— **Binet** (Steph.) S.J. Tessera Salutis, seu Ratio expedita ostendens cultum, Devotionem erga Dei param Virginem unam esse ex Notis insignioribus Prædestinationis. 12mo. *Aug.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

[1620]. **Lenis** (V.) *pseud.* V. Lenis..... Philosophiæ Augustinianæ de libero arbitrio vindicis epistola prodroma gemella, etc. 4to.
Rare.

——— **Baarle** (Kasper von) Kort bewijs van den .....calumnien . ...van P. du Molin, ghetoghen vyt syn..... boeck ... ...Anatomie Arminianismi, etc.
4to. *Lug. Bat.*

——— [**Poppius** (E.)] Antwoordt op de malitieuse calumnie der contra Remonstranten, etc. 4to. [*Leyden*].

[1620]. Der Contra remonstranten Kerfstock die nim—mermeer yser wordt: aen de Roomsche Catholijcken .....door een lief-hebber van de vrye waerheydt.
4to. [*Harlem*].
In Verse.

——— **Du Moulin** (Pierre) The Anatomy of Arminianisme. Translated from the Latin. 4to. *Lond.*
Very rare.
There is a copy in the Brit. Mus.

1621. **Vry** (F. de) Historie de kerckelijcke beroerten van Hollandt, etc.
4to. *Amst.*
Vry was also author of "Hist. ofte Kort....verhael van den oorspronch," etc.

——— **Uytenbogaert** (J.) Vrye aenurysing v. de onwaerheyden in de ghenaemde historie v. F. de Vry. 4to. S.L.

——— **Mentzerus** (Bath.) Trias dissertationum Theologicarum de Electione ad Vitam æternam, de Lingua Lutherana Synodi Dordracenæ et mente Calvin.
4to. *Giessæ.*

——— **Cameron** (Joh.) Amica Collatio de Gratiæ et Voluntatis humanæ concursu in vocatione. *Lugd.*
This Ed. not in Brit Mus.
Another Ed., *Leydæ*, 1622, 4to.
This appears also in the Author's collected works *Gen.*, 1658, fol., p. 607. It is an account of a conference between Cameron and Tilenus held at L'Isle near Orleans in 1620, and continued for 5 days. Cameron was Prof. in the University of Saumur in 1618, and subsequently in the University of Glasgow. He was a moderate Calvinist of the Baxterian type. See 1618.

——— **Wendelinus** (Marc. Frid.) Tract. de Prædestinatione. 4to. *March.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

1621. **Primirosius** (Dav.) Theses 200 de Prædestinatione, Libero Arbitrio, efficacia Gratiæ, et amplitudine mortis Christi. *Basiliæ.*
The previous year he had written "Theses XLII de Necessitate satisfactionis Christi pro peccatis." *Salmur.*

——— **Junius** [YOUNG] (Andreas) De Providentia et Prædestinatione, Meditationes Scholasticæ. *Lugd.*
Another Ed., *Lugd.*, 1678, fol.
The Author was a Roman Catholic.

——— [**Nemeagius** (A.)] Openinghe der Synodale Canones begrepen in hat eersta (Tweede) Hooftoluck. Waer in claerlijch bewesen wort hoe onghefondeest de selve zijn, ende szijdick met de Schriftur, etc.

——— Oordeel.....van het Synode Nationael.....tot. Alez... . over het Synode National .....tot Dordrecht in ... 1618 ende 1619, etc. 4to. *Amst.*

1621. Acta ofte Handelingen des Nationalen Synodi tot Dodrecht as 1618 ende 1619. fol. *Dordrecht.*

——— **Breganius** (Raym.) Enarrationes quinque theologiæ gentium de cognitione divina. 4to. *Venet.*

——— **Vænius** (Otton.) Physicæ et Theologicæ conclusiones de Prædestinatione, libero arbitrio, etc. *Ursellis.*
Another Ed., *Lug. Bat.*, 1622.

——— **Monavius** (Jac.) Epistola de Negotio Prædestinationis.

——— **Crocius** (Lud.) Examen Descriptionis Calvinistarum Matth. Hoëi, et contra Jac. Reinecci Libellum de Ortu, Progressu, et exitu calvinistarum.
8vo. *Bremæ.*

——— **Wadding** (Petrus) Disputatio Theologica de Prædestinatione et Gratia; in qua controversia illa celebris inter Gomaristas quos vocant, et Arminianos exorta de quinque fidei capitibus, explicatur. 4to, pp. 25. *Antv.*
The date on book is MD.XXI.
The Author was a Jesuit, born at Waterford, in Ireland, in 1580. He was Prof. of Canon Law in the University of Gratz, and died 1644.
The work is not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Thummius** (Theod.) Panurgia Satanæ, hoc est, refutatio vani et profani illius calvinistarum dogmatis quo statuunt, &c., semel electos. 4to. *Tub.*
Another Ed., *Francof.*, 1624, 4to.

——— **Carvalho** (Paul) M.S. De Prædestinatione.
This MS. is preserved in the Library of the Jesuits' College at Evora.

——— **Tilenus** (Dan.) Traité de la cause et de l'origine du péché. 8vo. *Paris.*

1621. **Thummius** (Theod.) Disputationes de libero arbitrio.
4to. *Francof.*

See 1627.

——— ——— Synopsis doctrinæ de æterna salvandorum prædestinatione.
4to. *Tub.* et *Francof.*

Another Ed., 1700, 8vo.

——— **Turingus** (Sam.) Disp. de merito Christi et ejus explicatione.
4to. *Giessæ.*

1622. **Bernhardinus** (Theoph.) De Religiosæ Perseverantiæ præsidiis.
Antv.

——— Canones Synodi Dordracenæ cum notis Dan. Tileni. 8vo. *Paris.*

[1622]. **Bergius** (Jo.) De æterno providentiæ ac prædestinationis decreto.

Not in the Brit. Mus.
Also Author of "Diatribe de primo Homine," *Francof. ad Od.*, 1619, 4to, and 1621, 4to; and "Wille Gottes von aller Menschen Seeligkeit," *Berlin*, 1653, 4to.

1622. **[Dwinglo** (Bern.)] Grouwel der Verwoestinghe stænde in de Heylighe plaetse dat is...Verhael van de Nulliteyten des nationalen Synode, etc.
4to. *Enghuysen.*

——— **Henpelius** (Frid.) Disputatio de æterna Prædestinatione Filiorum Dei ad Salutem. *Argent.*

——— **Tilenus** (Daniel) Amica Collatio de gratiæ et voluntatis concursu in vocatione et quibusdam annexis, instituta inter...D. T. et J. Cameronem.
4to, pp. 315. *Lug. Bat.*

——— Confessio sive Declaratio Sententiæ Pastorum, qui in Fœderato Belgio Remonstrantes vocantur, super præcipuis articulis Religionis Christianæ.
4to. *Herder-wici.*

This confession of Faith of the Arminians was drawn up by Episcopius. An Edition appeared in London, 12mo, in 1702.

——— **Calderwood** (David) Paraclesis contra D. Tileni Silesi Parænesin ad Scotos Genevensis Disciplinæ Zelotas conscriptam. 4to.

A Francisian Divine of the Ch. of Scotland, and an eminent writer on behalf of the Presbyterians. The above work was published with his celebrated "Altare Damasceuum," in 1625; which so displeased the king, but met with the approval of the Puritans. Another Ed., *Lugd. Bat.*, 1708, 4to.

——— **Romæus** (Nic., *S.J.*) Jo. Calvini, nova effigies centum coloribus ad vivum expressa; accedit de Prædestinatione et Justificatione; item Calvini Confessio ex Equuleo. fol. *Antv.*

Not in the Brit. Mus

1622. **Vaeck** (Alard.) Tractatus Theologicus de libero Arbitro Hominis.
Rintelii.

Another Ed., *same place*, 1624, 4to.
Neither Ed. in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Giustiniani** (Benoit) M.S. De Gratia. fol.

This work was not printed, in consequence of the order of the Pope as to the publication of works on this subject.

——— **Corvinus** (Joh. Arn.) Petri Molinæi novi anatomici mala encheireses, seu Censura Anatomes Arminianismi.
4to, pp. 743. *Francof.*

——— ——— Examen eorum quæ Pet. Molinæus disputavit contra doctrinam Arminii et eorum quos in Belgio Remonstrantes vocant 4to. *Francof.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Grotius** (Hugo) Disquisitio an Pelagiana sint ea dogmata quæ nunc sub eo nomine traducuntur.
8vo. *Paris.*

Hugo Grotius, more properly Hugh D'Groot, was one of the greatest men of his age. He was born at Delft, 1583, and died 1643. He was sent to England on behalf of the Arminians, and had many conferences with James I. His greatest work is his "De Jure Belli et Pacis."

——— **Alvarez** (Did.) Resp. ad objectiones contra concordiam liberi arbitrii cum divina præscientia, providentia et Prædestinatione. 8vo. *Lugd.*

——— **Williams** (Grif.) Delight of the Saints; or, a Treatise of Grace and Peace. Sm. 8vo. *Lond.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.
Williams was Bishop of Ossory.

——— **Lyserus** (Polyc.) De libero arbitrio. Unpaged. 4to. *Lips.*

——— **D.** (C. P.) Judicium de Discrimine inter Melanchthonem et Allobrogas in Doctrina Prædestinationis. 8vo.

Calvinistic.

——— **Grotius** (Hugo) Bewijs der ware Guds-dienst, *item* belijdenisse van 't gevoelen der Remonstrantem. 4to.

——— **Egardus** (Paul.) Homo microcosmus naturalis et supernaturalis, secundum naturam et gratiam in Adamo et Christo. 4to. *Hamb.*

——— **Aylett** (Robert) Thrift's Equipage: viz., five Divine and Morall Meditations of..... Providence [in verse]. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Barnes** (Thomas) The gales of grace; or, the spirituall winde; wherein the mysterie of sanctification is opened and handled. 8vo. *Lond.*

The Author was a preacher at Much-Waltham, in Essex.

——— **Dent** (Arthur) The Plaine Man's Path-Way to Heaven, wherein every man may clearely see whether hee shall bee saved or damned. Set forth Dia-

logue-wise, 18th impression corrected and amended. 8vo. *Lond.*
Another Ed., *Lond.*, 1664, 12mo; *Lond.*, 1682, 18mo, 41st Ed.; *Lond.*, 1831, 12mo.

1622. **Sweeper** (Walter) Israel's redemption by Christ, wherein is refuted the Arminian Universall Redemption. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Tilenus** (D.) Considerations sur les canon ..des Eglises Reformées, &c. 8vo.

——— **Dedekennus** (Geo.) Christliche Antwort des Tractatleins Joan Lampadii von der Gnadenwahl, und ihrer angehangten Frag. 8vo. *Hamb.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Lignaria** (Herm.) De libero hominis arbitrio, Theses Theolog. 4to. *Bernæ.*

———**Wendelinus** (M.F.) Tr. Theologicus et Scholasticus de Prædestinationis objecto. 4to. *March.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Languitius** (Matth.) Cœlestes Etesiæ : Kühle süfflein der Gnade und Barm herzigkeit Gottes. 8vo. *Hamb.*

——— **Movius** (Casp.) Demonstratio horrendorum Calvinianorum de Electione et Reprobatione Dogmatum. 4to. *Regiom.*

——— **Kilius** (Geo.) Refutatio solida objection. Calvinisticarum quas adv. Symboli Augustani confessores movent in hisce præcipuis IV. locis (IV.) De Prædestinatione, &c. 8vo. *Lips.*

1623. **Crakanthorpe** (Rich.) De Providentia Dei Tractatus. 4to. *Cantabrigiæ.*

——— ——— A Sermon on Predestination. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Albertus** (Aloys.) De Prædestinatione et Reprobatione. *Ven.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Faber** (Phil. Fav.) Disp. de Peccato Pœnitentia, Purgatorio, Suffragiis, Indulgentiis, et de Prædestinatione. fol. *Ven.*

——— **Herice**(Valintin de)Tractatus IV. —I De Scientia Dei—II. De Voluntate Dei—III. De Dei Providentia, Prædestinatione et Reprobatione. fol., pp. 876. *Pampilonæ.*

"Ejus ingenii suavitas, perspicacia et facilitas, ubertas doctrinæ cum brevitate in variis opinionibus obscuris et difficillimis questionibus explicandis, disponendis, probandis, fortissimis argumentis solvendis omnium amorem et admirationem sibi conciliat."—*Hurter.*
Lipenius, Bibl. Real. Theol. II. 731 gives the date as 1622.

1623. **Turrianus** (Louis) Tractatus de Gratia, in sexdecim opuscula distinctus. pp. 656, 4to. *Lugd.*

——— **[Uytenbogaert** (J.)] Oorspronck ende voortganck der Nederlandsche Kerckelijcke Verschillen, tot op het Nationale Synodus van Dordrecht, etc. fol. S.L. [*Amst*].

——— **Puteanus** (Carol. Hyacint.) De Providentia, Fato et Felicitate hominum. 4to. *Brux.*

——— **Capellus** (Jac.) Theses theol. de Controversiis, quæ Belgium fœderatum vexant, et satiusne fuerit, Arminii doctrinam tolerari, quam damnari? 4to. *Sedan.*

The Author was Prof. of Divinity at Sedan. He was a Calvinist, and Episcopius replied to the above work. Capellus charges the Arminians with detracting greatly from the power of God, since they represent the numerous attempts and the mighty struggles of Divine Omnipotence as capable of being always overcome by man, and assert that they are in fact every day successfully resisted. The reply of Episcopius on this point is particularly effective.

——— **Keckius** (Jod.) Responsio ad Quæst. Utrum Prædestinatio ad Vitam Æternam sit universalis an particularis, à Johanne Webero discussa. 8vo. *Halæ.*
Date in Lipenius, 1622, ii., 48 and 526.

——— **Vaeck** (Alard.) Tractatus Theol. de Prædestinationis Natura. 4to. *Rint.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Giesenius** (Joh.) Viæ salutis meditatio, de Gratiâ in Adamo amissâ et per Christum reparatâ. 8vo. *Rint.*
Another Ed., *same place*, 1629, 8vo.

——— **Cramer** (Andr.) Osterschatz, aus Christi todt und auferstehung hervorgesucht, in gerechtigkeit, fried und freud des heiligen geistes. *Magdeb.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.
Another Ed., 1624.

——— **Cotzibuvius** (Jo.) and **Evenius** (Sigism) Enodatio quæstionis de habitu theologico, &c. *Magdeb.*
Not in the British Museum.

——— **Cramer** (Andr.) Grundlicher bericht und nothwendige erinnerung von der jungstentstandenen streitsache, &c. *Magdeb.*
Not in Brit. Mus.

——— **Cotzibuvius** (Jo.) Apologia. *Witteb.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Cramer** (Andr.) Erinnerung vom grund und erbauung des wahren christenthums. *Magdeb.*

[1623]. **[Corvinus** (J. A.)] De bekeringe van den gepredestineerden Dief, of 2e samensprekinghe tuschen Remonstrantsgesinden predicant.....ende een Dief. 4to.

[1623]. **Assum** (Joh.) Spiegel der Erkäutniss Gottes und Christi. 8vo. *Eckf.*

1623. **Johannes** (Christ.) De Peccato Originali. 4to. *Witt.*

——— **Cotzibuvius** (Jo.) Gegenerinnerung auf M. Crameri, &c. *Magdeb.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

1624. **Cramer** (Andr.) Pedigt vom reiche gottes und des teuffels, am sontag judica gehalten. *Magdeb.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Cotzibuvius** (Jo.) et **Evenius** (Sigism.) Christliche betraurung der fast seltsameu verwirrung M. Andr. Crameri, daraus, &c. *Magdeb.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Cramer** (Andr.) Schreiben an einen guten freund. *Magdeb.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— ——— Fernere erinnerung vom grund und erbauung des christenthums *Magdeb.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— Controversia Crameriana Magdeburgensis.

——— **Cotzibuvius** (Jo.) et **Evenius** Sigis.) Wiederholter nichtiger umschweif M. Crameri. *Magdeb.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Schultetus** (Christophorus) Resp. Apostasia Adami, sive disputatio de peccato protoplastorum primo. *Præs.* J. Gerhardi, &c. 4to. *Jenæ.*

——— **Thummius** (Theod.) Panurgia Satanæ de Amissione gratiæ. 4to. *Francof.*

——— **Robinson** (John) An Appeale in truths behalfe (concerning some differences in the Church of Leyden).
The Author was an English clergyman, suspended by his bishop for nonconformity in ceremonies. He settled in Amsterdam in 1608, and at Leyden in 1609. He also wrote "Defence of the Doctrine propounded by the Synode at Dort," 1624, 4to, pp. 203.

——— **Hall** (Joseph, *D.D.*) The True Peace maker: laid forth in a Sermon before his majesty at Theobald's Court, Sept. 19, 1624. *Lond.*
Also among his "Three Tractates," 1646, 12mo, and in collected Works, *Oxf.*, 1837, 12 vols, 8vo, vol 10 pp. 471, Via Media; the way of peace in the Five Busy Articles of Arminius. p. 499, A letter concerning falling away from grace. vol ix., p. 465, Concio coram Synodo Dordrechtana, and a Serm. preached before the Synod of Dort. vol xii., p. 344, Oratio valedictoria apud Synodum Dordrechtaneam. p. 357, Letter to Dr. Fuller, exculpatory of certain proceedings at the Synod of Dort. The Author was one of the most eminent divines of his age, and has been called the Christian Seneca. He was one of the delegates to the Synod of Dort, was made Bishop of Exeter, 1627, translated to Norwich in 1641, and died 1656. There have been numerous Editions of his works, *Lond.*, 1808, 10 vols, 8vo.

1624. **[Neree** (Rich. Jean de)]Actes du Synode National tenu à Dordrecht, l'an 1618 et 1619, &c. 3 vols, pp. 618, 332, 356, 4to. *Leyden.*

——— **Aquilovicanus** (Min.) Examen Thesium Theologicarum Jac. Capelli, quas inscripsit, De controversiis quæ Fœderatum Belgium vexant, et Satiusne fuerit tolerari sententiam Arminii quam damnari? 8vo. *Thlibochori.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Du Moulin** (Peter) De la justé Providence de Dieu. *Genev.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.
The Author was a celebrated French Protestant Minister, Prof. of Philosophy at Leyden. He received a Doctor's degree from Cambridge, and finally became Prof. of Divinity at Sedan.
Also Author of "De Cognitione Dei Tractatus," *Bremæ*, 1626, 12mo; Lat. and Fr., *Hagæ Comitis*, 1631—16? Eng.; *Lond.*, 1634, 4to; another in French, *Geneve*, 1637, 8vo.

——— **Vereem** (Johannes) Defensio doctrinæ de Perseverantia sanctorum. 4to. *Groning.*

——— **Conrius** (Flor.) Tractatus de statu parvulorum sine baptismo decedentium ex hac vita; juxta sensum B. Augustini. 4to. *Lovanii.*
Another Ed., *Lovanii*, 1641, 4to: *Rothom.*, 1643, fol.; 1562, fol.
The Author was Archbishop of Tuam.

——— **Weinrichius** (Tho.) Examen Sententiæ Synodi Dordrechtanæ, de absoluto Prædestinationis ac Reprobationis Decreto. 4to. *Lips.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Coppenstein** (Joh. And.) Ex Bellarmino Epitome omnium Controversiarum Luthero-Calvinisticarum. *Mogunt.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Bodecherus** (Nic.) Sociniano-Remonstrantismus; hoc est Demonstratio Remonstrantes cum Socinianis in pleribus confessionis suæ partibus consentire ostenditur. 4to. *Lugd. Bat.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.
Episcopius replied to this work; see Vol. 2 of his collected works, part 2, p 48, and as to the controversy, Walch, ii., 534.

——— Bodecherus ineptiens, hoc est, apologia confessionis Remonstrantium contra Bodecherum. pp. 44, 8vo. [*Leyden?*]

——— **Pennottus** (Gabr.) Propugnaculum humanæ libertatis; seu Controversiarum pro humani arbitrii libertate

contra Philosophos, Astrologos judicarios et Hæreticos tuenda, &c.
pp. 606, fol. *Lugd.*

"Quem pessime Calviniani omnes oderunt, quod lethales ab eo plagas acciperunt. Hinc et apud Arminianos vigebat et multorum manibus versabatur hoc opus ad humanam libertatem propugnandam destinatum, teste Guil. Tussio."—*Hurter.*

1624. **Cameron** (Joh.) Defensio de Gratia et libero Arbitrio, contra Epistolam alicujus anonymi.
8vo. *Salmurii.*

Also in the Author's collected works, *Gener.*, 1658, fol. p 715, in which will also be found, p. 793, his "De electionis et oppositæ reprobationis objecto."

——— **Montagu** (Rich., Bishop of Norwich) A Gagg for the New Gospell? No, a new Gagg for an old Goose, who would needes stop all Protestants' mouths for ever, with 276 places out of their own Bibles. 4to. *Lond.*

The Author was an Arminian, and will best be remembered for the part he took in opposing the notion that the Canons of the Synod of Dort are of any authority in this country, which as Heylin observes, "neither Laud, Howson, nor Corbet could bring to pass, none of them being able to break through those difficulties which opposed, until Montagu took the work in hand; who being well backed, and having the ice somewhat broken before him, waded with confidence and courage through the midst of these waters."—*See Ante, pp.* 99 and 101.

——— **Robinson** (John) Defence of the doctrine propounded by the Synod of Dort against John Murton and his associates.

[1624]. **Bagusa** (Jos.) MS. in the Library of the College of Palermo, "De Natura et Gratia."

See De Backer, vol i., p. 602.

1624. **Gerhard** (John M.) Apostasia Adami sive disputatio de peccato protoplastorum primo, e gemina sede, Gen. iii., 1 – 8. 4to. *Jenæ.*

The Author was Prof. of Divinity at Jena, in 1616, and was sometime Rector of that University. His work displays extensive reading and great erudition.

——— Spiegel van der Arminianer calumnie ende onrustigen lenghen-geest. soo de selve vander Calvinisten tyrannije lestleden heeft uyt-ghestroyt.
4to. *Amst.*

——— **Lonnius** (Florent.) Tractatus de Statu Parvulorum, sine baptismo decedentium ex hac Vita, juxta sensum B. Augustini compositus. 4to. *Lovan.*

1625. **Turrianus** (Louis) Diversorum Opusculorum Theologiæ.
4to. pp. 712. *Lugd.*

Opusc. IV. De Scientia Dei circa futura absolu-

Opusc. V. and VI. De Voluntate Dei.

1625. **Battus** (Barth.) De possibilitate apostasias sanctorum.
8vo. *Gryphiswaldi.*

See 1620.

Another Ed., *Witteb*, 8vo, without date, but earlier than the above.

——— **Drelincourt** (Chas.) De la persévérance des Saincts, ou de la fermeté de l'amour de Dieu. 18mo. *Charenton*

An Ed. in German, 1641, 12mo.

The Author died in 1669, aged 74 He was a French Protestant whose writings have been highly esteemed. Best known for his "Charitable visits," a work which has been translated into six different languages. He wrote also a "Defence of Calvin."

——— **Montagu** (Rich.) Appello Cæsarem, a Just appeal from two unjust Informers. 4to. *Lond.*

By proclamation dated 17 Jan., 1628, called in and suppressed.

——— **Sancto-Joseph** (Petrus à) Tractatus de Gratia Divina actuali et habituali. 8vo. *Paris.*

The Author was a French monk, d. 1662.

——— ——— Tract. Thomist. de Libero arbitrio in communi, circa ea quæ sunt ordinis naturalis. fol. *Olissip.*

——— **Himmilius** (Johan.) Concordia concors Papæ-Calvinistica opposita concordiæ Luthero-Calvinisticæ J. A. Coppensteinii, &c. 4to. *Jenæ.*

——— **Rostius** (Geo.) Anti-Crotius.
8vo. *Rostoch.*

——— **Steckerus** (Joh.) Invicta assertio Deum Calvinistarum esse auctorem et causam peccati et vere peccantem, etc. 8vo. *Rostoch.*

——— **Walæus** (Ant.) Responsio ad Censuram J. Arn. Corvini, et ad Anatomen Arminianismi Petri Molinæi.
4to. *Lugd.-Bat.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

Also in vol 2 of his Opera Omnia, *Lug-Bat.*, 1647, 2 vols, fol.

——— **Jackson** (Thos., *D.D.*) Works.
4to. *Lond.*

Vol IX. p. 425. Rom. IX, 16. Salvation only from God's grace; p. 448, Rom. IX, 18, 24, Just hardening of Pharoah. The Author was Pres. of Corpus Christi College, 1630; Preb. of Winchester, 1635; Dean of Peterborough, 1638; d. 1640. In his Comments on the Creed, book X, he treats of the Freedom of Will. He is said to have been a rigid Calvinist; but Dr. Richard Neile, Bishop of Durham, taking him for his chaplain, convinced him of the errors of absolute Predestination. Probably the fact helped the argument!

——— **Brandt** (J.) Sententiarum theologicarum ex articulo de Deo patre filio et spiritu, de creatione, providentia, etc., brevis expositio. 12mo. *Erf.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Ferrarius** (Joh. Bapt.) Cathedra Calvinistarum. 8vo. *Paris*

1625. **Cramer** (Andr.) Weiderholte kurtze erklærung des habitual-streits. Not in Brit. Mus.

——— **Meisnerus** (Balth.) Anthropologia sacra. 8vo. *Witteb.*

[1625]. **Biscopius** (Isaac) *Resp.* Disputatio de divina prædestinatione, *Præs.*, A Walæo

1625. **Eldere** (Abrahamus ab) *Resp.*, Disputatio de peccato originali. *Præs.*, A Riveto. 8vo.

——— **Zelius** (Joannes) *Resp.*, Disputatio de lapsu Adami. *Præs.*, J. Polyandro. 8vo.

——— **Durfeldius** (Jo.) Perseverantia sanctorum Christiana. 8vo. *Rost.*

Another ed., 1643.

1626. **Cameron** (Jo.) Prælectiones theologicæ. 3 vols. 4to. *Salmur.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— A dangerous plot discovered by a discourse, wherein is proved that Mr. Rich. Montague in two bookes, the one called A New Jagg, the other A Just Appeale; laboureth to bring in the faith of Rome and Arminius under the name and pretence of the doctrine of the Ch. of England. 4to. *Lond.*

——— Pelagius Redivivus; or Pelagius raked out of the ashes by Arminius and his Schollers. 4to. *Lond.*

This work is attributed to Daniel Featley.

——— A Second Parallel, together with a Writ of Error [by Daniel Featley] used against the Appealer [*i.e.* R. Montagu]. 4to. *Lond.*

——— Parallelismus novantiqui erroris Pelagiarminiani. 4to. *Lond.*

Directed against R. Montagu by Daniel Featley. The English translation of this is entitled "Pelagius Redivivus," etc.

——— **Hunnius** (Nic.) Διάσκεψις de Fundamentali dissensu Doctrinæ Evangelicæ Lutheri et Calvinianæ seu Reformatæ. 8vo. *Witteb.*

Also Author of "Controversia de Universalitate Meriti Christi, contra Calvinianos, Manichæos," *Witteb.*, 1617, 4to; 1618, 8vo.

——— **Rous** (Franc.) Tutio Veritatis of King James of the Church of England, and the Catholicke Church, planely shewed to bee one in the points of Predestination, Freewill, certaintie of Salvation, with a discourse of the grounds Naturall [and] Politicke of Arminianisme. 4to. pp. 92. *Lond.*

The Author was M. P. in the first and in later Parliaments of Chas. I., Provost of Eton, 1643. He was one of the few laymen appointed by the House of Commons to sit in the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, d. 1659. His works were published 1657, fol.

——— Traité contre l'erreur et renouvelle des Predestinez. 16mo. *Paris* (Roman Catholic.)

1626. **Baylæus** (Thos.) De Merito mortis Christi, &c. 4to. *Oxoniæ.*

——— Censura in Confessionem sive Declarationem Sententiæ qui eorum in Fœderato Belgio Remonstrantes vocantur super præcipuis articulis Christ. Religionis, a S.S. Theol. Professoribus Academiæ Leidenses instituta. 4to. *Lug.-Bat.*

The Authors of this refutation were Polyander, Rivetus, Walæus, and Thysæus.

——— Suffragium Collegiale Theologorum Magnæ Britanniæ de quinque Controversiæ Remonstrantium Articulis, &c. 4to. *Lond.*

This was by G. Carleton, Bishop of Llandaff. A Translation was published in English in 1629, 8vo.

——— **Himmilius** (Johan.) Anti-Coppensteinius. 4to. *Jenæ.*

——— [**Episcopius** (Sim.)] Apologia pro confessione, sive declaratione sententiæ eorum qui in Fœderato Belgio vocantur Remonstrantes, contra censuram quatuor Professorum Leidensium. 4to.

Other eds., 1627 and 1629, 1630, sm. 4to.

——— **Balinghem—Balingen** (Ant. de) Solatium Afflictorum ab unica Numinis Providentia petitum. 8vo. *Col. Agr.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Hortigosa** (Peter) M.S. De Natura theologicæ; De Dei essentia et Perfectionibus, de ejusdem scientia, Providentia et Prædestinatione.

The Author was a Jesuit who died in 1626. See De Backer, iv. 306.

——— **Sanderson** (Robt., *D.D.*) Sermons. fol. *Lond.*

Grace. Other ed., 1632, 4to; 1656; 1657; 1660; 1671; 1681 called 7th ed.; 1686, 1689 called 8th ed.; 1696; best ed., 1841, 2 vols. The Author was bishop of Lincoln. He was at first a rigid Calvinist on the five points, and in the margin of his 12 Sermons, pub. 1632, *Lond.*, fol., will be found some accusations of Arminius for false doctrine, but Dr. Hammond, on a visit to him at Boothly-Pagnel in 1649, convinced him of the absurdity and impiety of the doctrines in question in their rigid sense—See too 1660.

——— **Carleton** (Dr. Geo.) An examination of those things wherein the author of the late appeale (R. Montagu) holdeth the doctrines of the Pelagians and Arminians to be the Doctrines of the Church of England. 4to. *Lond.*

There was a second edition the same year to which was affixed a "Joynt attestation avowing that the discipline of the Church of the Eng. was not impeached by the Synod of Dort."

A 3rd Ed. of above work, 1636, 4to. The 3rd ed. is not in the B.M., and the 2 copies of the 2nded. there are imperfect. He also wrote another work to show that the discipline of the Ch. of Eng. was not impeached by the Synod of Dort, *Lond.*, 1628, 4to.

——— **Jackson** (Thos.) A Treatise on the Divine essence and attributes. 4to. *Lond.*

Another Ed., *Lond.*, 1628, sm. 4to. Also in

vol 5 of his collected works, *Oxf.*, 1844, 12 vols, 8vo. In vol 9, the Fall of Adam, and Freewill, Grace, the hardening of Pharaoh's heart, etc.
See also 1625.

1626. [**Grevinchovius** (N.)] Vertoogh van den contra Remonstrantschen JoabsKus. Dat is out deckinghe vande vin nigheyt.....die zeecker.....contra-Remonstrant heeft gepleegt, onder decsel van eenen Vermaenbrief aende Remonstrantsche Gemeynte van den Briel. 4to. *Rotterdam*

——— **Deppenius** (Otto) *Resp.*, Disputatio.....de imagine Dei in primo homine.—De regeneratione hominis peccatoris. 8vo.

[1626.] **Wilkinson** (John) The sealed Fountaine opened. 12mo. [*Lond.*]
Shewing that some infants are in a state of grace, and capable of the "seales," and others not. Written against J. Morton.

——— **Yates** (James) Ibis ad Cæsarem, or an answer to Mr. Montague's appeal in points of Arminianisme and Popery. 4to. *Lond.*
Very rare. See Lipenius Bibl. Real. Theol, vol. 1, p. 97.

1626. **Smising** (Theod.) Disputationum Theologicarum, Tom. I. De Divina Providentia, etc. *Antwerp*

——— **Prynne** (Will.) The Perpetuitie of a Regenerate man's estate, wherein is manifestly proved.....that such as are once truly regenerated..... can neither finally nor totally fall from grace, etc. 4to. *Lond.*
This celebrated writer's 1st work. 2nd Edition, *Lond*, 1627, 4to. 3rd Ed., *Lond.*, 1627, 4to.

1627. **Goulart** (Simon) Traité de la providence de Dieu, et autres points dependants, avec une refutation du sermon de Joseph Poujade contre les cinq articles des Remonstrans. 12mo.

——— **Hakewill** (Geo., *D.D.*) Apologie of the Power and Providence of God in the Government of the World. fol. *Oxford.*
This first edition which is rare, appeared under the initials "G. H." only. 2nd Ed., *Oxf.*, 1630, fol.; 3rd Ed., and best, *Oxf. and London*, 1635, fol. "There have been many great inquests," says Joshua Sylvester, "to find the cause why bodies still grow less, and daily nearer to the pigmies size." To confute this opinion Hakewill wrote his apology. "A work admirably interesting as well by its piety as its learning."—*Todd.* Dug. Stewart observes that it is "the production of an uncommonly liberal and enlightened mind, well stored with various and choice learning, collected both from ancient and modern authors." A Lat. Ed., *Oxon.*, 1635; see Athen, Oxon.: Walker's Sufferings of the Clergy; Usher's Life and Letters. Hakewill was Archdeacon of Surrey in 1616.

——— Examen Disputationis Walæi de 5 Controversis Remonstrantium articulis. *Harderv.*

1627. **Giesenius** (Joh.) Disp. de Electione et Reprobatione. 4to. *Rint. ad Visurg.*

——— **Ward** (Sam., *D.D.*) Suffragium Collegiale Theologorum Magnæ Britanniæ, de 5 controversis Remonstrantium articulis, item, Concio de Gratia discriminante. 4to. *Lond.*
Reprinted in 1633, 8vo or 12mo. The Author was a Fellow of Emmanuel Col., and Master of Sidney Sussex Col., 1609; Archdeacon of Taunton, 1615; Preb. of York, 1617; Vice Chancellor of Cambridge, 1620; Margaret Prof. of Divinity, 1622; d. 1643.

——— **Mentzerus** (Balth.) De persona Christi, de baptismo, de cœna Domini et de prædestinatione. 8vo. *Marp.*

——— **Tayleurus** (Franc.) Vocatio Divina, seu Meditationes in Rom. i. 7. 8vo. *Lond.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Pemble** (Will.) Vindiciæ Gratiæ. [Edited by Rich. Capel]. 4to. *Lond.*
Another Ed., 1629, 4to.

——— **Drexelius** (Hier.) Heleotropium, seu Conformatio Humanæ Voluntatis cum Divina. pp. 569. 12mo. *Monaci.*
This 1st ed. is rare and is illustrated with some very fine and curious plates.
It is not in the Brit. Mus.
Various other ed., *Antv.*, 1627, 24mo; *Monaci*, 1628, 24mo, pp. 716; and 1629; *Colon.*, 1629, 16mo; *Colon.-Agrip.*, 1630, 16mo; *Monachii.*, 1630, which is the only ed. in the Brit. Mus. *Antv.*; 1633; *Duaci*, 1633, 24mo, pp. 570; *Colon.*, 1634, 12mo. A French version 1640 and 1642, 12mo, pp. 574; and *Brux.*, 1858, 12mo, pp. 308. A German version, *Munich and Cologne*, 1687. An English trans. by Rev. R. W. Shutte, with preface by the late Bp. of Brechin, 1863, 8vo; & 1881, 8vo. 4th Ed. *Lond.*, 1884, pp. xxii, 276, 8vo.

——— **Thummius** (Theod.) Disp. 20, contra impietatem Photinianam, de immortalitate animæ, libero arbitrio, etc. 4to. *Tub.*

——— **Weemse** (John) The Portraiture of the Image of God in Man in his three estates of creation, restauration, glorification. See 1632. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Socinus** (Faustus) Prælectiones Theologicæ. 4to. *Rac.*
Also in vol 1, p. 537, of his Opera Omnia, *Irenop*, 1656. 2 vols, fol.

——— **Keller** (Joan.) Dissertatio Theologica de Prædestinatione et Reprobatione hominum. (Pres. Gasp. Lechnero Resp. J. K.) sm. 8vo. pp. 100. *Dilingæ.*

——— **Forbes** (John) *Præs.*, Vindiciæ theologicæ pro perseverantia sanctorum in gratiâ salvificâ etc, Resp. Leslæus (G.) 4to.
Not in the Brit. Mus. under Forbes.

——— **Sydenham** (Humphrey) Jacob and Esau. Election, Reprobation, opened and discussed by way of Sermon at Paul's Crosse, March 4, 1622 4to. *Lond.*

Another Ed., 1637, 4to.
The Author was Fell. of Wadham; Rector of Ash Brittle, of Porklington and Oldcombe, all in Somersetshire, and deprived during the Rebellion. d. 1650. He was called "the Silver-Tongued Sydenham." Wood, Athen. Oxon.

1627. **Lintreus** (Barth. Pet.) Definitiones veteres sedis apostolicæ de gratia Dei, collectæ studio. B. P.L. 2nd ed. 8vo. *Duaci.*

——— Examen disputationis theologicæ Ant. Walæi de quatuor controversis Remonstrantium articulis. 4to. *Harderv.*

——— Vrye Godesdienst oft' Samensprekinghe tusschen Remonstrant en Contra Remonstrant over de vrye godts-dienstighe Vergaderinghen, etc. [Jean Doucher, or Corn. Dunganus] 4to.

1628. **Villegas** (Andr. Henr. de) Controversiæ de Deo uno; id est, de Dei Scientia et ideis ac voluntate, de prædestinatione item ac reprobatione hominum. fol. *Compluti.*
The Author was a Prof. of Divinity in the Academy of Complute.

——— **Petrus Blessensis** (Barth.) Apostolicæ Sedis veteres Definitiones de Gratia Dei. 8vo. *Duaci.*
Opera Omnia, *Paris*, 1667, fol. The Author was Archdeacon of Bath, and Chancellor of Canterbury, and his letters are remarkable specimens of Epistolary correspondence, and are full of interest from his intimacy with Hen. II., with whom he sided against Thomas a Becket. It has been said that in 'transubstantialis virtute verborum,' used in his letter to Peter, the Deacon, on the Eucharist, we have the first known use of the term Transubstantiation.

——— **Field** (Richard) Of the Church fol. *Oxf.*
In this complete Ed. appears an appendix, and in the 10th Chapt. of such appendix is demonstrated the unvaried *protestancy* of the Church in regard to the doctrine of Freewill.

——— **Williams** (John) Perseverantia sanctorum. A Serm. 4to. *Lond.*
The Author was Dean of Salisbury.

——— **Vossius** (Ger. Jo.) Theses theologicæ et historicæ de variis doctrinæ capitibus, etc. 4to. *Bellositi Dobunorum.*
Another ed., *Hagæ.*, 1658, which ed. is not in the Brit. Mus.
The Author was a Canon of Canterbury, see 1618.

——— **Dürfeldius** (Jac.) De Quæstionibus nonnullis de libero arbitrio et baptismo. 8vo. *Rost.*
Another Ed. same place, 1643, 8vo. Neither ed. in Brit. Mus.

——— **Hanneken** (Menon.) Dispp. Hebræo-Theologicæ de hominis creatione, corruptione, conversione. 4to. *Marp.*

——— **Rhostius** (Geo.) Anti-Crocius, de Auctore Peccati, &c. 8vo. *Rost.*

1628. **R.** (J.) The Spy, discovering the danger of Arminian heresie, and Spanish trecherie (in-verse). 4to. *Strasburgh.*
Rare, having been strictly prohibited. The Gordonstown copy sold for £4 16s.

——— **Feurbornius** (Just.) Anti-Ostorodus, seu Refutatio hæretici libri Ch. Ostorodi, Dia. XXX. *Marp.*

——— **Scharpius** (Joh.) Cursus Theologicus. 2 vols. *Aureliæ Allobr.*
Art. de Prædest.

——— Responsio necessaria ad Contra Remonstrantium Declarationem. 4to. *Lug. Bat.*

——— **Baillie** (Alex.) A true Information of the Unhallowed Offspring, Progress, and Impoisoned Fruits of our Scottish Calvinian Gospel and Gospeller, wherein the chief heads of Religion, now counteracted are discussed. 8vo. *Wirtsb.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Ruiz de Montoya** (Diégo) Commentarii ac Disputationes ad quæstiones XXIII et XXIV, et prima parte S. Thomæ, de Prædestinatione ac reprobatione hominum et angelorum. fol. pp. 654. *Lugd.*
Another ed., same place, 1629, fol. He wrote also "De Scientia, Idæis, veritate ac vita Dei," *Paris*, fol.; and "De Voluntate Dei," *Lugd.*, 1630, fol. A Jesuit, born at Seville, and died in 1632.

——— **Pitboys** (Claude) L'horoscope des prédestinez. 12mo. *Paris.*

——— Cælestius I, Epistola pro Prospero et Hilario, de Gratia. *Atreb.*

——— A Proclamation for the suppressing of a Booke, intituled Appello Cæsarem, or, An Appeale to Cæsar (written by R.M.), &c. (17 Jan., 1628, O.S.) fol.
A copy is in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Boucher** (R. P.) Les triomphes de la religion chrestienne, contenant les resolutions de CCCLXVI questions sur le sujet de la foy ..... de la redemption du genre humain, de la divine Providence, &c. fol. *Par.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Wildius** (Joh. Dan.) Amphitheatrum Providentiæ Divinæ. 12mo. *Hanov.*
This ed. not in the Brit. Mus., but one there *Basil*, 1660, 8vo.

1629. **Arminius** (Jac.) Opera Theologica. 4to. pp. 966. *Lug. Bat.*
This ed. is very rare. It is said to have been "authoritate publica suppressa." Reprinted at *Francof.*, and at *Lug. Bat.*, 1631, 4to; also at *Erf.*, 1635, 4to; *Francof.*, 1635, and 1635, 4to. See as to this writer, *Christian Review*, Sept., 1829; pp. 493—510, and *ante*, p. 65. In English by W. Nichols, *Lond.*, 1825—75, 3 vols, 8vo; and *New York*, printed 1853, 3 vols, 8vo, by Bagnall (W. R.)

——— **Potter** (Christopher, *D.D.*) A Letter vindicating his sentiments

touching the Predestinarian controversies.

Another ed., 1651, 12mo. Reprinted in Camb. Tracts, 1719. The author was an Arminian, and Vice-Chancellor of Univ. of Oxford, 1641, and Dean of Durham, 1645.

1629. **Prynne** (Will.) God no Imposter nor deluder, or an Answer to a Popish and Arminian Cavill in the defence of Free Will and Universal Grace.
4to. S.L. [*Lond*].

——— **Prynne** (Will.) The Church of England's old Antithesis to New Arminianisme. pp. 149. 4to. *Lond.*

This 1st ed. is rare. Another ed., *Lond.*, 1630, 4to, under the title "Anti-Arminianisme, or The Ch. of England's old Antitheses," &c. This was answered by Giles Widdows, formerly Prynne's tutor at Oriel, in a piece entitled "The Lawless kneeless, schismatical puritan," &c., *Oxf.*, 1631, 4to.

——— **Dausquius** (C.) Conciliabuli Dordraceni Ascia.
8vo. *Rigiaci Atrebatium.*

——— **Carleton** (Geo.) The Collegiat Suffrage of the Divines of Great Britain. 8vo. *Lond*

——— **Ames** (Guil.) Anti-Synodalia, seu Animadversiones in Scripta Synodalia Remonstrantium, quoad Articulum primum. 8vo. *Francof.*

Another ed., *Amst.*, 1633, 12mo.

The author was a great Calvinist divine, Prof. of Divinity at Franecker, and d. in 1633.

——— **Pemble** (W.) Tract. de Providentia Dei. 18mo. *Lond.*

Edited by Rich. Capel. This is a philosophical tract not mentioned by Ant. A. Wood. The author was a Puritan—a rigid Calvinist of the old school, b. 1591, d. 1623. Other eds. of above work *Lond*, 1631, 12mo; *Oxon*, 1669, 8vo. His collected works, *Lond.*, 1635, fol., 3rd ed.

——— **Kellison** (Matthew) A Treatise of the Hierarchy of the Church against the Anarchy of Calvin. 8vo.

——— **Stengelius** (George) Disputatio theologica de Prædestinatione justorum et reprobatione malorum.
4to. pp. 95. *Ingolst.*

The author, a distinguished Jesuit, published also the same year his "Disputatio theologica de Providentia Numinis," *Ingolst.*, 4to, pp. 33; and in 1651, *Ingolst.*, 4 vols, 4to, his "Opus de Judiciis Divinis."

A Roman Catholic.

He also wrote "De Divinorum Judiciorum ac præcipue, quibus hunc Mundum regit Deus, Justitia et æquitate," *Diling.*, 1641; *Ingolst.*, 1651, 4to.

——— **Alvarez** (Didac.) De Origine Pelagianæ hæresis. 4to. *Trani.*

The author was a Roman Catholic, Doctor of Theology, Archbishop of Trani, d. 1635.

——— **Brest** (Jodocus) *Resp.*, Animadversiones in Synodalia Scripta Remonstrantium, quoad Articulum primum, &c., *Præs.*, Ames (Guil., *D.D.*)
8vo. *Franckeræ.*

1 62 **Costius** (Geo.) *Resp.* Animadversiones in Synodalia Scripta Remonstrantium. 8vo.

——— Apologia pro Confessione.
4to. *Harderw.*

Arminian.

——— **Molinæus** (Pet.) Thesium theologicarum de peccato originali, &c., præside P. M. 4to. *Sedan.*

——— **Gisenius** (Jo.) Via Salutis Meditatio de Gratia in Adamo amissa et per Christum reparata. 8vo. *Rintel.*

——— Anti-Montacutium: or an Appeal or Remonstrance of the Orthodox Ministers of the Church of England against R. M., clerke, lately made Bp. of Chester. 4to. *Edinb.*

In this piece we are told that Montague's appeal [1625] being translated into Latin and sent abroad, was condemned by the reformed churches of Geneva and France, and the ecclesiastical states of Germany, & the Netherlands; and that his works were so much hated in the church of Scotland that they were held fit only "to stop mustard pots," pp. 3 and 33.

——— **Polyandrus** (Joh.) Miscellaneæ tractationes theologicæ in quibus agitur de prædestinatione et gratia Dei, &c.
8vo. *Lug. Bat.*

1630. **Riviere** (A.) Calvinismus bestiarum Religio, et appellatio pro D. Banno contra P. P. de Bellis. sm. 8vo. *Lugd.*

The real author was Theop. Raynaud, the Jesuit.

——— Specimen Calumniarum atque heterodoxarum opinionum ex Remonstrantium apologia excerptarum per Theologiæ Professores in Acad. Leydensi. 4to. *Lug. Bat.*

——— Remonstrantium in Belgio apologia pro confessione contra Censuram Professorum Leidensium. 4to. *S.L.*

Very rare.

[No date.] **Davenport** (Christ.) De Prædestinatione.

1630. **Davenant** (John, *D.D., Bishop of Salisbury*) Dissertationes duæ de morte Christi et de Prædestinatione. *Cantab.*

Other ed., *Cantab.*, 1650, fol.; 1683, 12mo, and several later. In Eng., *Lond.*, 1832, 8vo, in the 2nd vol of the Author's work on the Colossians, p. 311. Davenant was a sublapsarian, and was one of the delegates sent to the Synod of Dort, by K. James I., 1618. He was certainly one of the most able writers by which the sublapsarian hypothesis has been supported, d. 1641, see *ante* p. 106. The MS. of the above dissertations had been in the possession of Archbp. Usher, who affirmed them to be "learnedly, soundly, and perspicuously performed."

——— **Gibieuf** (Gul.) De libertate Dei et Creaturæ, lib. 2. 4to. *Paris.*

——— **Roberus** (Paul) De Justificatione peccatoris coram Deo. *Wittebergæ.*

——— Typus prædestinationis, et conceptionis Mariæ filii Dei Immaculatæ.
8vo. *Antv.*

1630. **François** (James) Causa salutis infantium, adversus infanticidium Tabennense, in duas actiones divisa. 12mo. *Mussiponti.*

The author was a Jesuit, Prof. of philosophy, first at Dillingen, and afterwards at Pont-à-Mousson, where he successively occupied the chairs of philosophy and theology. He died in 1639. In the above work he attacked the Calvinists, who did not lay sufficient importance upon the Sacrament of baptism in regard to children.

[1630]. The nine Assertions, or Articles of Lambheth, composed and agreed upon at Lambheth-house...in.....1595, etc. 4to.

——— **Grafius** (Simeon) Calvinische Himmels-Leiter, oder *contrafait* der vorigen Calvinischen Lehre, von der *Prædestination.* *Leipz.*

[1630]. **Simpson** (Edward) A Treatise concerning God's Providence in regard to Evil and Sin.

The author was a Fellow of Trinity Coll., Camb. and Rector of Eastling, 1618, and Preb. of Coringham; d. 1651.

——— **Volkelius** (Jo.) De Vera Religione, lib. v.; quibus præfixus est J. Crelii liber de Deo et ejus attributis, &c. 4to. *Rocoviæ.*

"Primum hoc est systema theologicum quod ex Socini schola prodiit."—*Reimam.* "Amstelodami publice combustæ sunt. Hinc raritas ejus, quæ tanta est, ut narrante Sandio, pro uno exemplari persoluti fuerint xxv. nummi Hungarici aurei."—*Vogt.*

1631. **Eckhardus** (Hen.) Fasciculus Controversiarum Theologicarum, Questiones fere omnes atque singulas, de quibus inter Augustanæ Confessionis Theologos et Calvinianos disceptatur, continens. sm. 8vo. *Lips.*

This vol. contains the opinions of Zwinglius, Œcolampadius, Calvin, Martyr, Beza Ursinus, Zanchius, Bucanus, Piscator, and all the fathers of the Reformed Church, extracted from their works and arranged under the various heads controverted between them and the Lutherans, &c. There have been several editions. The above ed. not in the Brit. Mus., but the 1st ed., *Lipsiæ*, 1611, 8vo, is there. Also author of "Disputatio Anti-Pelagianarum," *Giessæ*, 4to.

——— **Barret** (William) Articuli Lambethani... .. Lanceloti Andrewes ..... de Synodo oblatis articulis Judicium, una cum ejusdem censurâ censuræ D. Barreti, de certitudine salutis, etc. 12mo.

Several ed., 1694, 12mo; 1696, 12mo; 1700, 12mo; 1720, 8vo. In English, 1700, 12mo; 1710, 12mo.

——— The Copie of an answere Unto a certaine letter: wherein the answerer purgeth himselfe, and others from Pelagius' errors. Published about the second or third yeare of Q. Elizabeth, by a Protestant Divine, etc. 4to.

1631. An Historicall Narration of the Judgement of some most learned and godly English Bishops, holy Martyrs, and others, concerning God's election, and the merit of Christ his death, etc 4to. *Lond.*

This book was called in and suppressed by Abbot Archbp. of Cant, on the ground that it contained dangerous Pelagian and Arminian opinions. It was licensed by Ed. Martine, Chaplain to Laud, who was then Bp. of London. The book was re-issued under a new title in 1641. See note in Printed Catalogue of Brit. Mus.

——— **Burton** (Hen.) The Law and the Gospel reconciled against the Antinomians, with a Brief Catalogue of their Doctrines. 4to. *Lond.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

Burton was a Puritan Divine, and educated at St. John's College, Camb. He became Rector of St. Matthew's, Friday St., London, about 1626. He was deprived for a time of his living but restored in 1642; shortly afterwards he became an Independent, d. 1647—8.

——— **Pellham** (Edward) God's Power and Providence; shewed in the miraculous Preservation of eight Englishmen left in Greenland in 1630, nine moneths and 12 dayes. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Gouge** (William, *D.D.*) God's, Three Arrows; plague, famine, sword; in three treatises. 4to. *Lond.*

To these is added a Discourse on The Extent of God's Providence. Gouge was also the author of a Sermon on the Progress of Divine Providence, *Lond.*, 1645, 4to. He was Rector of St. Ann's, Blackfriars, and one of the Assembly of Divines, 1643. He was one of those who protested against the murder of Charles I.

——— **Ruiz de Montoya** (Didac.) Commentarii ac Disputationes ad quæstionem XXII. et bonam partem quæstionis XXXIII. ex prima parte S. Thomæ, de Providentia prædefiniente, ac præbente prædestinationis exordium. fol. pp. 500. *Lugd.*

The author seems to have left a MS. entitled "De Auxiliis divinæ gratiæ." See De Bacher ii., 538—see also 1628.

——— **Downame** (Geo., *D.D.*) The Covenant of Grace, or an Exposition upon Luke 1, 73, 74, 75. 4to. *Dublin.*

Another Ed., *Lond.*, 1647, 12mo. The author was educated at Cambridge, and was a Fellow of Christ Ch., 1585. He became Bp. of Derry, 1616, and is styled by Leigh in his Treatise of Religion and Learning, "a learned and Godly bishop."

——— **Downame [or Downeham]** (Geo., *D.D.*) A Treatise of the certainty of Perseverance maintaining the trveth of the 38th Article of the Nationall Synode holden at Dublin in the yeare 1615. *Dublin.*

Suppressed by royal proclamation, addressed to Archbishop Usher, 24th August, 1631. Very rare.

1631. Responsio Remonstrantium ad Specimen Calumniarum, etc. *Harderv.*

——— **Piscator** (Joh.) Responsio ad Scriptum L. Lucii de causa meritoria nostri coram Deo Justificationis, cum animadversionibus Tho. Gatakeri. *Lond.*

——— **Campanella** (Tho.) De Prædestinatione, Electione Reprobatione et auxiliis divinæ gratiæ cento Thomisticus. fol. *Rom.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

Another ed., *Paris*, 1636, 4to. Subjoined is "Expositio cap. IX. Epistolæ ad Romanos." "Deserit auctor in scripto hoc doctrinam Augustini et Thomæ, ac dogmata tradit, haud ad probanda." *Walch* i, 202. Campanella was a Roman Catholic, & a Philosopher of Italy, persecuted by the Spaniards and protected by Pope Urban VIII, and later by Cardinal Richelieu. Like his great contemporary Bacon, he attempted to deduce all knowledge from experiment. He exposed the futility of the Aristotelian philosophy, but was not himself blessed with a sound judgment. He d. 1639.

——— **Vedelius** (Nic.) De Arcanis Arminianismi, lib. 2. sm. 8vo. pp. 661. *Lug. Bat.*

Another ed., same place, 1632, 4to. Also author of "Beständigheit in Glauben," 12mo, and "Vindiciæ doctrinæ Remonstrantium," 4to.

——— **Usher** (Jac.) Goteschalchi et Prædestinatianæ controversiæ ab eo motæ Historia. 4to. pp. 237. *Dublin.*

This edition is very rare, being the first book in Latin printed in Ireland. Another ed., *Hanov.*, 1662, 12mo—see Clarkes' Success of Jac., Lit. ii., 501. The author was the well known Archbishop of Armagh. In 1615, he drew up the Articles of religion for the Ch. of Ireland, introducing therein the Lambeth Articles. He was a Calvinist, at least until the concluding years of his life, see p. 65.

——— **Sibelius** (Casp.) Conciones in Epistolam Judæ. *Amst.*

Vol iv., p. 138.

——— **Preston** (John, *D. D.*) Life Eternall; or a Treatise of the knowledge of the Divine Essence and attributes, in 18 Sermons. 4to. *Lond.*

Other ed., *Lond.*, 1634, 8vo; 1638, sm. 4to. The author was a Calvinist divine, Master of Emmanuel Coll., and Lecturer in Trinity Ch., Camb. He wrote also "The New Covenant," and a treatise on Christian freedom, *Lond.*, 1641, 4to. See his life by Clarke, in which is an interesting account of his controversy with Bishop Montague, the Arminian, on the subject of Predestination.

1632. **Albiz** (Martinus de) De altissima scientia, inscrutabili voluntate ... prædestinatione, ac ineffabili Trinitate Dei opt. Max fol. *Compluti.*

Very rare.

——— **Du Moulin** [or **Molinæus**] (Pet.) La Sainct resueil spirituel; ensemble un traitté de la juste providence de Dieu. 8vo. *Genev.*

1632. **Du Moulin.** Enodatio quæstionum de Providentia, libero Arbitrio, &c. 8vo. *Lug. Bat.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Twisse** (Will., *D.D.*) Vindiciæ Gratiæ potestatis ac providentiæ Dei; hoc est Responsio ad examen Lib. Perkinsiani de Prædestinatione a Jac. Arminio institutum. fol., pp. 707. *Amst.*

Other Ed., same place, 1648, 1652, fol.

Twisse was Prolocutor of the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, 1643; died 1646. He was a man of extensive knowledge and a subtle disputant. The elder Spanheim styles him 'subtilissimus Theologus simul et Philosophus.' He was particularly famous for his disputes with the Arminians, being himself a Supralapsarian. He assisted Sir Henry Savile in his Edition of Bradwardine's De Causa Dei.

——— **Sutton** (Tho., *D.D.*) Lectures upon the 11th Chapter to the Romans. 4to. *Lond.*

The Author was minister of St. Mary Overies, Southwark; died 1623.

——— **Cowper** (Will.) Heaven opened, manifesting the Counsaile of God concerning Man's salvation. 4to.

Not in the Brit. Mus.

The Author was Bp. of Galloway; died 1619.

——— **Bize** (Vedastus) De Providentia Dei circa res temporales. 8vo. *Duaci.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Rivetus** (Andr.) Prælectiones in cap. xx. Exodi, in quibus explicatur Decalogus, ut casus conscientiæ. 4to. *Lug. Bat.*

P. 427 on Original Sin. Also in vol 1 of Opera Theologica; *Roter.*, 1651, 3 vols, fol.

——— **Spreewen** (Guil.) Fasciculus Myrrhæ, sive pii Discursus super Mysteria Redemptionis humanæ. *Tungris.*

——— **Raynaudus** (Theoph.) Valerianus Cemeliensis Episcopus integer doctrinæ, latisque purus. Disquisitio Theologica qua Massiliensium sive semipelagianorum error circa salutis initium accurate excutitur, et Parcus charitatis Valeriani criminator repellitur. Cui accessit censura inofficiosæ censuræ Libri de Prædestinatione, et Gratia. 12mo. *Lugd.*

——— ——— Censuræ inofficiosæ censura qua liber de Prædestinatione et Gratia, Beato Fulgentio Ruspensi Episcopo asseritur et niteus purusque præstatur. 8vo. *Lugd.*

——— **Weemse** (John) An Exposition of the Laws of Moses. 3 vols, 4to. *Lond.*

Vol. 2, p. 25, Adam's knowledge before his fall. P. 32, The law written in man's heart after his fall.

The Author was Prebendary of Durham and minister of Dunse; died 1636.

The above work contains a deal of quaint information, much curious and valuable matter being injudiciously mixed with rabbinical fancies.

1632. **Philadelphus** (Eugenius) [Annat, F.] Exercitatio scholastica contra novam rationem tuendi physicas præmotiones liberorum agentium, eorumque libertatem exponendi adversus D. Gibieuf. 8vo. *Cadurci.*
Another Ed., *Paris*, 1662, 4to.

——— **Forbes** (John) A Sermon discussing the true meaning of these words: The I. Epist. of Timothy, the 2 chapt., verses 1 to 4. Who will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth, &c. 16mo. *Delph.*
The author was successively minister of Alford, Middelburg, and Delft.

——— **Episcopius** (Sim.) Imbecillitas pietatis doctrinæ Jacob. Triglandii in libro contra Angustam portam Eduardi Poppii.
To this work Trigland replied in a work entitled "*Imbecillus remonstrans, prostratus ac dilaceratus vi doctrinæ veritatis, quæ secundum pietatem est.*" Episcopius responded in *Vi pietatis prostrata ac dilacerata Jacob. Triglandii, partim omissis responsionibus; partim infirmis subterfugiis.* For the continuation of the discussion, see Walch, ii., 550.

1633. **Mæratius** (Lud.) Disputationes in summam Theologicam S. Thomæ: de Deo, de Angelis, de bonitate et malitia actuum humanorum, de peccatis, de legibus. 3 vols, fol. *Lut. Par.*
Vol 2, De Gratia.
The Author was a Jesuit, rector of the College of Bourges; died in 1664.

——— Britanniæ Theologorum Suffragium de controversis Remonstrantium Articulis. 12mo. *Lond.*

——— **Testard** (Paul) Synopsis Doctrinæ de Natura et Gratia. *Blæsis.*
The Author was a follower of Cameron and Amyrault—being a moderate Calvinist or Baxterian. Grotius' judgment of these men was "Testard and Amyrault do nothing more than varnish over *bad doctrines* with *fair words*, and they *take away* with the one hand whatever they have been compelled by the light of scripture to *deliver* with the other."

——— **Gee** (Edward) A Treatise of Prayer and of Divine Providence as relating to it. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Vaeck** (Alard.) Von der ewigen Gnaden-Wahl. 8vo. *Hamb.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.
A Lutheran.

——— **Kearnæus** (Barnabas) Heliotropium, seu Conciones de Mysteriis Redemptionis humanæ, quæ in Dominicâ Passione continentur. 8vo. *Par.*

——— **Delkerrus** (Joh. Mich.) Electorum libri duo. *Jenæ.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

———Doctrine of Predestination, Freewill and certainty of Salvation according to the Ch. of England. 4to.
(Calvinistic).

1633. **Baillie** (Rob.) De Prædestinatione. *Amst.*
Another Ed., *Amst.*, 1663, fol.
The Author was a Presbyterian Divine, Regent of Philosophy, and Prof. of Divinity in, and finally Principal of the Univ. of Glasgow. He was one of the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, 1643. He was a strong Calvinist; died 1662. See 1640, 1641, for his other works.

——— **Peltius** (Joh.) Harmonia Remonstrantium et Socinianorum. 4to, pp. 261. *Lugd. Bat.*

———**Vedelius** (Nic.) Arcanorum Arminianismi, pars 2 and 3. *Lug. Bat.*

——— **[Episcopius** (Sim.)] Vedelius Rhapsodus, sive Vindiciæ Doctrinæ Remonstrantium a criminationibus et calumniis Nicolai Vedelii. 4to, pp. 224. *Harderw.*

——— **[Hoard** (Sam.)] God's love to mankind manifested by disproving his absolute decree for their damnation. 4to.
Another Ed., *London*, 1673. 8vo, pp. 220.
The Author was originally a Calvinist, but subsequently an Arminian. This treatise is concise, learned and judicious, and a powerful attack on the results of Calvinism. Still in parts the author is mistaken as to what Calvin held.

——— **Himmelius** (Jo.) Matæologia Papistica. *Jenæ.*
He was also the author of 5 disputations, "contra absolutam calvinianorum, etc.," *Jenæ*, 1640, 4to.

——— **Brochmand** (Casp. Erasmus) Systema Universæ Theologiæ. 2 vols. *Hafniæ.*
Art. De lib. Arb. Hom.; De Prædestinatione; De Homine primo; De Pecc. Orig.
Not in the Brit. Mus.

1634. **Himmelius** (Joannes) Calvinismus sive Collegium Anti-Calvinianum, quo mataeologia Calviniana disputationibus XIII.....refutatur, &c. 4to. *Jenæ.*

——— **Vedelius** (Nic.) De Arcanis Arminianismi, pars 4ta. 4to. *Lug. Bat.*

——— **Davenport** (Fra.) or Sancta Clara. Deus Natura, Gratia, sive Tract. de Prædestinatione, de meritis et Peccatorum remissione et de Sanctorum invocatione. 4to, pp. 372. *Lugd.*
The Author became a Franciscan, and adopted the name of Sancta Clara. He was one of the Chaplains to Henrietta, queen of Charles I., and afterwards confessor to the queen of Chas. II. His endeavour to get the work printed in England under the sanction of Archbp. Laud was one of the charges brought against the unfortunate Archbishop. The work was put into the Index Expurgatorius of Spain, and all but committed publicly to the flames in Italy.—*Heber's Life of Taylor.* "I must here notice a contest, which happened concerning the book entitled *Deus, Natura et Gratia*, the author whereof was Mr. Davenport. This book was highly esteemed by his majesty, as being full of complaisance for the Protestant system in several points, and discovering an inclination of approaching nearer to them

by concessions, where the catholic cause would permit it to be done. But the work was far from being liked at Rome, where it was considered as a very dangerous production, far too condescending to schismatics and heretics; the generality also of the English Catholics were displeased with it."—*Panzani's Memoirs.* It is remarkable as being the first attempt to reconcile the Churches of England and Rome, and from its rarity, was a few years back reprinted and translated into English.

1634. **Wendelinus** (Marc. Frid.) Christianæ Theologiæ, libri ii. 8vo. *Han.*

Lib. i., c. iii., v., and vi.
This Ed. not in the Brit. Mus.
Other Ed., *Amst.*, 1653, 12mo; *Lugd. Bat.*, 1656, 12mo; *Amst.*, 1657, 12mo.

——— **Henneken** (Mennone) Assertio veræ et salutaris doctrinæ de justificatione hominis peccatoris coram Deo, contra Pontificorum Gratiæ imprimis Bellarmini, Becani, et Sanderi sophisticationes. 4to. *Marpurgii.*

——— **Bereur** (Ludov.) Disputationes Quadripartitæ de modo conjunctionis concursuum Dei et creaturæ ad actus liberos Ordinis naturalis, adversus Prædeterminantium et Assertorum Scientiæ Mediæ Modernorum opiniones. *Lugd.*

Not in the Brit Mus.

——— **Amyraut** (Moses) Traité de la Predestination. 8vo. *Saumur.*

A work of merit. Other Ed., *Saumur*, 1643 and 1658, 8vo.
Amyraut was a Calvinist, and a little inclined to mysticism. Mosheim speaks of him as "a man of a sound understanding and subtle genius, to whose writings even such men as Placette and Pictet owed a considerable part of their glory." He died in 1645.
The above work is not in the Brit. Mus.

——— An Apology of English Arminianism. 8vo.

——— **Ames** or **Amesius** (Guil.) Rescriptio ad Responsum Grevinchovii de Redemptione Generali et Electione. 8vo. *Lug. Bat.*

Other Ed., *Herder.*, 1645, 2 vols, 12mo; *Amst.*, 1650, 12mo; 1658, 12mo.
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Dola** (Lud. a) Disputatio de modo conjunctionis concursuum Dei et creaturæ ad actus liberos ordinis naturalis, præsertim autem ad pravos, adversus prædeterminantium et assertorum scientiæ mediæ modernorum opiniones. 4to. *Lugd.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.
Another Ed., same place, in 1684.

——— **Beverovicius** (Joan.) Epistolica quæstio de vitæ termino Fatali an Mobili? 2 partib. cum doctorum Responsis. 8vo. *Dordraci.*

2nd Ed., 1636, *Lug. Bat.*; a 3rd Part, *Lug. Bat.*, 1639, 4to. See as to this Author, *Arpe*, p. 74. In his "Epistolicæ quæstiones," *Roterd*, 1641, sm. 8vo, p. 165, De providentia Dei in politicis.

1634. **Sperlingius** (Joannes) De Fortuna, Casu et Monstro.

The Author was a Professor of Physics at Witteberg.

——— **Vaeck** (Alard.) Bestændige und ausführliche erklärung des hoben articuls von der ewigen gnadenwahl. 8vo. *Schaumburg.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Burchardus** (Mauritius) Assertio sanæ doctrinæ de Peccato originis. 4to. *Lips.*

1635. **Downame** (Geo.) The Christian's freedom; or, the Doctrine of Christian Liberty. 12mo. *Oxford.*

The Author was Bp. of Derry.
Reprinted 1785, 12mo; and 1832, 18mo; 2nd edition of the reprint, *Lond.*, 1836, 12mo.
The original edition is not in the Brit. Mus., neither is the reprint of 1785.

——— **Pemble** (Wm.) Works. fol. *Lond.*

On Grace and Providence.
Other Editions in 1649, 4to, *Lond.*; 1659, fol., *Oxford*, See also 1629.

——— **Sabunde** (Raym. de) Theologia Naturalis, sive liber Creaturarum, specialiter de Homine, et de Natura ejus, et de his, quæ sunt ei necessaria ad agnoscendum se ipsum, et Deum, et omne debitum, ad quod Homo tenetur et obligatur tam Deo quam proximo. 8vo. *Franc.*

——— **Lobbetius** (Jac.) De Peccato, ejus Natura, Pœnis ac Remediis. 8vo. *Antv.*

——— **Blanchodus** (Sam.) Disputatio Theologica de Sanctorum Perseverantia. 4to. *Lond.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Calixtus** (Geo.) De Providentia Dei. 4to. *Helmst.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.
The Author was a learned Lutheran Divine, who died 1656.

——— **Harsnet** (Adam) Touchstone of Grace, serving for the Tryall of a man's Spirituall Estate. 18mo.

——— **Voet** (Gisb.) Thersites Heautontimorumenos. 4to. *Ultraject. Arminian.*

1636. **Lyserus** (Will.) De Prædestinatione pro Balth. Meisnero contra Wendelinum. 4to. *Witteb.*

——— **Schlichtingius** (Jon.) Quæstiones Duæ: 1. Num in Evangelicorum religione dogmata habeantur, quæ vix ullo modo permittant, ut qui ea amplectatur, nullo in peccato perseveret? 2. Num, in eadem religione, quædam concedantur Christi legibus inconcessa? 8vo.

1636. **Rutherford** (Sam.) Exercitationes apologeticæ pro Divina Gratia contra Jesuitas et Arminianos. 8vo. *Amst.*

Other Ed., *Amst.*, 1637, 8vo; *Francof.*, 1638, 1651, 1652, and 1660, 8vo; the Ed. of 1651 only in the Brit. Mus. In consequence of this work, written against the Episcopal clergy, the Author was summoned before the High Commission Court, and for a time suspended from his ministry. He was Commissioner to the Assembly of Divines of Westminster, 1643—7; Princ. of New Coll., St. Andrew's, and afterwards Rector of the University.

——— **Triglandus** (Jac.) De Trina Dei Gratia, Electionis, Sanctificationis et Conservationis. 8vo. *Amst.*

Another Ed., same place, 1669, 8vo.

——— **Grotius** (Hugo) Defensio fidei Catholicæ de satisfactione Christi adversus Socinum, cum G. J. Vossii ad Judicium Hermanni Raverspargeri de hoc libro responsione. 12mo. *Oxon.*

——— Syllab. ration. quibus causa Durandi de modo conjunctionis et concursuum Dei et creaturæ defenditur, et quorumdam recentiorum censura repellitur. 8vo. *Paris.*

——— **Voet** (Gisb.) Beverwychi Epistolica quæstio de vitæ termino fatali an mobile? cum doctorum responsis. 4to.

A 3rd Ed., *Ultraj.*, 1641, 8vo.

——— **Fromondus** (Libertus) Causæ desperatæ Gisb. Voetii adversus spongiam Corn. Jansenii, crisis.

Fromond was also author of the two following works, published without date. "Lucerna Augustiniana, qua breviter et dilucidè declaratur Concordia et Discordia, qua duo nuper ex D. D. Doctores S. Th. Duacen. conveniunt aut recedunt a cæteris hodie S. Augustini Discipulis," and "Theol. Arausicani Philosophiæ Augustinianæ de libero arbitrio vindicis, Epistola Prodroma gemella ad Dion. Petavium et Ant-Richardum," 4to.

The former of these two works was condemned by Innocent X., 23 April, 1654. Fromond was also Author of "Com. in St. Paul Epist.," 1663.

——— Arminian Mud Cart.—a Dutch publication. 4to. *Amst.*

——— **Höpffnerus** (Joh.) Quæstio Theologica de universali Christi merito enucleata et Molinæo opposita. 4to. *Lips.*

Also author of a book, "De Voluntate Dei," *Lips.*, 1637, 4to.

1637. **Lessius** (L.) Opuscula varia in unam corpus redacta. fol. *Paris.*

II.—De Providentia Numinis (see 1613).

V.—De Gratia Efficaci. Another Ed., *Antv.*, 1651, 8vo; *Lugd.*, 1651, fol.

The first mentioned work translated into Engl., *Lond.*, 1651, 8vo.

The Author was a Jesuit.

——— **Sydenham** (Humphrey) Five Sermons preached upon several occasions—Jacob and Esau, election and reprobation, Rom., IX., 18. 4to. *London.*

1637. **Hemelman** (George) Disputata Theologica in I partem S. Thomæ. fol. *Granatæ.*

Alegambe says "In Primam partem Summæ Theologiæ S. Thomæ. tomi IV. De Vita, Voluntate et Providentia Dei tam naturali quam supernaturali; et de Trinitate." The two last are in the College of Grenade, but have not been printed. De Backer, ii., 293. The Author was a Jesuit who died in 1637.

——— **Church** (Henry) Miscellanea Philo-Theologica; or, God and Man—A Treatise, describing the Nature of God in his Attributes, &c. 2 pts., 4to. *Lond.*

Another Ed., 1638.

——— **Feurbornius** (Just.) Trias Dissertationum Theologicarum, in quibus evincitur, quod Deus nullum omnino Hominem, ex absoluto ordine et simplici Decreto Divino in æterna ad Vitam sempiternam Electione præterierit. 4to. *Marp.*

——— **Crocius** (Joh.) Bericht von der Gnadenwahl und Beharrung der kinder Gottes. 4to. *Cassel.*

1638. **Calixtus** (Geo.) De Peccato Originali Disputatio. 4to. *Francof.*

Another ed., 1649.

——— [**Episcopius** (S.)] Den rechten Remonstrantschen Theologant, ofte clare vertooninghe van de rechte Theologie der Remonstranten. 8vo. *Amst.*

——— **Du Moulin** (Pet.) Examen de la Doctrine d'Amyrault et Testard, touchant la Predestination, et les poincts qui en dependent. 12mo. *Amst.*

——— [**Hooker** (Thos.)] The soule's vocation; or, effectual calling to Christ. By T. H. 4to. *Lond.*

The Author was a Puritan, and Fell. of Emmanuel Coll., Camb. He emigrated first to Holland, on being sentenced by Laud, and then to America, where he acquired some eminence. He died 1647, and his memory has been celebrated in the following stanzas:—

"'Twas of Geneva's heroes said with wonder,
(Those *worthies three*) Farel was wont to thunder,
Viret like rain on tender grass to show'r,
But Calvin lively oracles to pour.
All three in HOOKER's spirit did remain,
A son of *thunder*, and a show'r of rain:
A *pourer-forth* of lively oracles,
In saving souls, the *sum of miracles*."

——— [**Palearius** (Aonius)] The benefit of Christ's death; or, the glorious nature of God's free grace. By A. S. 4th Ed., sm. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Monerius** (T.) Theses Theologicæ de statu Adami ante lapsum. 4to. *Salmur.*

——— **Gerhard** (J.) Dissertationes theol. in quibus dogmata Calvinianorum juxta seriem M. F. Wendelini ex-

penduntur, tessaradecas (Ed. I. E. Gerhard). 4to. *Jenæ.*

1638. **Voet** (Gisb.) Gymnasium Ultrajectium. 4to. *Ultraj.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Hulsemann** (Joh.) De indebita et universali Controversiæ Gratia. 4to. *Witteb.*

——— ——— Diatribe Scholastica de Auxiliis Gratiæ quæ vocant, &c. 4to. *Lips.*

Other Ed., 1653, 1677. Also author of "Disputatio Theologica Solemnis de sanctissima et sufficientissima J. C. pro peccatis et salute totius humani generis satisfatione et merito," *Witteb.*, 1634, 4to.

1639. **Sancto—Joseph** (Pet. à) Concordia humana Libertatis cum certitudine Prædestinationis. *Par.*

——— **Twisse** (Wm.) Dissertatio de Scientia Media. fol. *Arnheim.*

——— Assertationes theologicæ de scientia, voluntate, prædestinatione ac reprobatione Divina. 4to. *Vilnæ.*

——— **Arbaldus** (Augustus) Theses Theologicæ de Lapsu Adami. 4to. *Salmur.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Junius** (Isa.) Antapologia, sive animadversiones in XVI priora capita apologiæ Remonstrantium. 4to. *Lug. Bat.*

A rare work.
Another Ed., *Delphis and Leidæ*, 1640, 4to.
Not in the Brit. Mus.
Lipenius only mentions the Ed. *Leidæ.*

——— **Drelincourt** (Chas) De la foy des estens, et de l'incredulité des reprouvez. 12mo. *Charenton*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Calixtus** (Geo.) Resp. Keæbergio, de æterna Prædestinatione. 4to. *Helmst.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Wildius** (Joh. Dan.) De Prædestinatione. 12mo. *Hanov.*

In German.

——— **Usher** (Arch. Jac.) Britannicarum Ecclesiarum Antiquitates. 4to. *Dubl.*

2nd & Best edition, 1687, fol.

——— **Ysambertus** (Nicol.) De Deo et Attributis ejus, &c. fol. *Paris.*

Also probably author of a work "De libero Arbitrio et Gratia," mentioned by Lipenius, Bibl. Theol. Real., vol 2, p. 184.

1640. **Baillie** (Rob.) Αυτοκατακρισις The Canterburians' self conviction. Or an evident demonstration of the avowed Arminianisme, Poperie, and Tyrannie of that Faction by their owne confessions [in works by W. Laud and others] With a postscript to the Personate Jesuite Lysimachus Nicanor [John Corbet]a prime Canterburian. 2 pts. 4to. [*Amst.*]

Another Ed. same year seems to have been published in *Edinburgh*, 4to; and *Lond.*, 1641, 4to.

[1640]. **Denne** (Henry) Grace, Mercy, and Peace, conteining (1) God's reconciliation to Man. (2) Man's reconciliation to God. 2 parts. 8vo. *Lond.*

1640. **Place** (Jos. de la) Diss. de statu hominis lapsi ante gratiam. 4to. *Saumur.*

——— **Grotius** (Hugo)Disquisitio an Pelagiana sint ea dogmata quæ sub eo nomine traducuntur. pp. 87. 12mo. *Paris.*

The 1st Ed. seems to have been *Paris*, 1610, 8vo. See Lipenius, Bibl. Theol. Real., ii, 462. Another ed., *Amst.*, 1679, fol.

——— **Kunadius** (Andr.) Disputatio Theologica de Prædestinatione Filiorum Dei ad Salutem. 4to. *Lips.*

——— **Hughes** (Lewis) Covenant of Grace, opened by way of question and answer. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Cosmopolitus** (Theoph.) De Absoluto Reprobationis Decreto. 8vo. *Hagæ.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Heidanus** (Abr.) Prœve ende wederlegginghe des remonstrantschen catechismi. *Lug. Bat.*

Another ed. same place 1641, and one in Latin, *Amst.*, 1678, 4to; and *Leidæ*, without date.

——— **Michael** (Joh.) Dilucidæ Paraphrases in IX. X. and XII. cap. ad Rom. 4to. *Hafniæ.*

——— **Jansenius** (Corn.) Augustinus, seu Doctrina S, Augustini de Humanæ Naturæ Sanitate, Ægritudine, Medicina adversus Pelagianos et Massilienses, accessit huic editioni Tractatus F. Florentii Conrii archiep. Thuamensis de statu Parvulorum sine baptismo decedentium juxta sensum B. Augustini. fol. *Louv.*

The Inquisition at Rome prohibited the reading of this work in 1641; and in 1642, Urban VIII, by a public decree, condemned it as contaminated with errors long since rejected by the Church—a sentence repeated successively by Innocent X., & Alexander VIII. Other ed., *Antv.*, 1640, fol.; *Paris*, 1641, fol.; *Rothon.*, 1643, fol., and 1652, 2 vols in 1, pp. 249, and 328. See Walch, Bibl. Theol., ii. 940; and *ante*, p. 37.

——— Amulonis Lugdunenis Archiepiscopi ad Gothescalcum Epistola, in qua ejus de Prædestinatione et Gratia errores aliquot reprehendit. Studio et Opera Jac. Sirmondi.

P. 1135, Sirmondi Varia Opera. Other Ed., *Paris*, 1649, 8vo; 1728, 2 vols, fol. In French, *Paris*, 1650, 8vo. Amolo d. 854.

——— De Absoluto Reprobationis Decreto; versio ex anglico. 8vo. *Amst.*

1640. **Davenant** (John, *D.D.*, Bp. of Salisbury) Animadversions upon a Treatise lately published and entitled "God's love to Mankind," &c.
8vo. *Lond.*

Another Ed., *Camb.*, 1641. Davenant maintains unconditional Election, and admits that in Election, reprobation is of necessity involved, but asserts that the latter "is not a denial of sufficient grace, but a denial of such *special* grace as God knoweth would infallibly bring them (the elect) to glory." It is a very able and forcible discourse in favour of the sublapsarian view. See 1630, and *ante* p. 106.

——— **Walæus** (Anthony) Loci Communes Theologiæ. 2 vols.
4to. *Lug.-Bat.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.
In vol 1 of his Opera Omnia, *Lug.-Bat.*, 1647, 2 vols, fol.

——— Solomons Sweert, Schydende de Remonstrantsche van de Reglsinnige leere. 4to. *Amst.*

——— **Amicus** (Fran.) Cursus Theologiæ Scholasticæ. 9 vols. fol. *Duaci.*

Vol 3, Gratia. Another ed., *Antv.*, 1650, fol.
The author was a Jesuit.
This book is not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Grotius** (Hugo) Philosophorum sententiæ de Fato et de eo quod est in nostra potestate. 12mo. *Amst.*

Other Ed., *Paris*, 1648, 4to., and *Amst*, 1648, 12mo.

1641. **Fenner** (Will.) The Riches of Grace. 4to. *Lond.*

Also in his Works, *Lond.*, 1657, fol., vol 2, in which vol. is a Treatise of Effectual Calling. Fenner also published a sermon on the Mystery of Saving Grace, *Lond.*, 1652, 12mo.
He was a Puritan, first a preacher at Sedgelly, Staffordshire, and after Rector of Rochfort, Essex, 1629.

——— **Milton** (John) Aminadversions upon the Remonstrants Defence against Smectymnus. 4to. *Lond.*

See too his collected Prose Works, *Amst.*, 1698, 3 vols, folio; *Lond.*, 1738, 2 vols, fol.; *Lond.*, 1806, 7 vols, 8vo.

——— **Warner** (Levinus) Diss. de vitæ termino, utrum fixus sit, an mobilis?
8vo. *Amst.*

Copy in Brit. Mus. Cat., dated 1642.

——— **Santesius** (Jo.) Horis subcisivis; sive exercitatio de termino vitæ humanæ. 8vo. *Vesal.*

——— **Stockman** (Pet.) Somnium Hipponense; sive judicium Augustini de controversiis theologicis hodiernis; relatore Philetymo, theologiæ Baccalaureo 4to.

——— **Conrius** (Flor.) Peregrinus Jerichuntinus, hoc est, liber de natura humana feliciter instituta, infeliciter lapsa, miserabiliter vulnerata, misericorditer restaurata. 4to. *Par.*

The author was Archp. of Tuam.

1641. **Liries** (Vincent.) Theriaca adversus Dionys. Patavii et Anton. Ricardi de libero Arbitrio, libros. 4to. *Paris.*

——— **Bailie** (Rob.) Scotch Antidote against the English infection of Arminianisme. 8vo. *Lond.*

An ed. also in 1652, 8vo. This 2nd ed. only in Brit. Mus.

——— **Amyraut** (M.) Doctrinæ Calvini de absoluto reprobationisdecre to defensio. pp. 276. 4to. *Salmurii.*

A French version in 1644, 8vo.
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Nierenberg** (J. E.) Theopoliticus, sive brevis illucidatio et Rationale Divinorum operum atque Providentia humanorum. pp. 571. 8vo. *Antv.*

Rare.
The Author was a Jesuit.
See De Bacher, iii. 534. No. 33, Dissertantur præcipua quæsita circa divin. providentiam, et tres cardines publicæ rei pie administrandæ digeruntur.

——— **Der-Kennis** (Ignatius) Theses Theologicæ de Gratia, libero arbitrio, Prædestinatione, etc., contra Cornelii Augustinum in sex capita divisæ.
fol. *Antv.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Voet** (Gisb.) Catechisatie oven den Catechismus der Remonstranten.
8vo. *Wiegb.*

Not in Brit. Mus.

——— **Accarigi** (Jacopo) Aristoteles, an agnoverit divinam providentiam in humanis præsertim rebus. Disputatio, &c.
4to. *Romæ.*

——— England's petition to her gracious king,
That he Arminius would to ruine bring. fol.

——— **Brinan** (P.) *Resp.* Sententia D. Augustini.....de gratia, lib. arbit. prædestinatione et reprobatione publice defensa, etc. 4to. *Lovanii.*

Pres. Joan. Barnewallo.

——— **Crocius** (Lud.) Dissertationum... .. ..De Naturæ humanæ per apostasiam peccati corruptione et ejusdem per gratiam Jesu Christi restitutione.
8vo. *Bremæ.*

——— **Eberhard** (Eli.) Gefallener und zu Freuden auffgerichteter Adam.
8vo. *Naumb.*

——— **Martinus** (Jac.) Tractatus de causa peccati. 4to. *Witteb.*

Another ed., *Norib.*, 8vo.

——— **Colindres** (Pet. de) Triumphus de Peccato Originali. 4to. *Asturgi.*

1641. **Zeger** (Jac.) August. Hippon et August. Ipresis de Deo omnes salvari volente et Christo omnes redimente homologia per theses aut apologeticos expressa, etc. 4to. *Siv.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Taylor** (Francis) The faith of the Church of England concerning God's work on man's will. 4to. *Lond.*

The author was Rector of Clapham, and was a Calvinist.

——— Censuræ Facultatum Sacræ Theologiæ Lovaniensis ac Duacensis super quibusdam articulis de S. Scriptura, Gratia et Prædestinatione, anno 1586 8vo. *Paris.*

Other Ed., *Paris*, 1683, 8vo, and 1724, 8vo.

——— **Cassian** (St. John) Opera Omnia. fol. *Par.*

D. Prosperi Aquitanici liber de gratia Dei et libero arbitrio contra Collatorem.

Cœlestini Papæ pro Prospero et Hilario, de gratia Dei Epistola.

Canones concilii secundi Arausicani, circa tempora Leonis Papæ i. de libero arbitrio, etc.

D. Prosperi epistola ad Augustinum.

Ex Didaci Alvarez de auxiliis divinæ gratiæ, etc.

Also to be found in Bibl. Max. Patr., vol 7, p. 15.

——— **Jonghe** (Jo. de) Theses Theologicæ de Gratia, libero arbitrio, Prædestinatione, &c., in quibus doctrina theologorum societatis Jesu contra Corn. Jansenii Augustinum defenditur. fol. p. 124. *Antv., et Paris.*

Another Ed., *Par.*, 1661, fol. Cet ouvrage fut mis à l'Index à Rome, non pour sa doctrine, mais uniquement parce qu'il traitait les matiéres *de auxiliis*, sans une autorisation spéciale du Saint Siége. De Bacher, ii. 316.

——— ——— Theses Theologicæ Apologeticæ priorum et Miscellaneæ adversus Doctrinam Cornelii Jansenii. fol. *Antv.*

1642. **Bernard** (Saint) Opera Omnia. fol. *Paris.*

Tractatus de gratiæ et libero arbitrio.

Various other editions. *Basiliæ*, 1552, 2 tom, fol.; *Paris.*, 1609, fol.; 1632, fol.; 1640, fol.; 1642, 5 tom, fol.; 1667—68, 6 tom, 8vo. *Coloniæ-Agrip.*, 1641, 7 tom, fol.; *Paris*, 1690, 2 vols, fol.; 1719, 2 vols, fol.; *Venet.*, 1726-27, 3 vols, fol.; 1765, 2 vols, fol.; *Paris*, 1839, 2 vols, 8vo. *Lugd. et Paris*, 1845, 2 tom, 8vo; *Lyon*, 1854, 2 tom, 8vo; *Migne.*, tom 182—185, 1844, 4to. *Treviris.*, 1861, 8vo; *Monasterii*, 1855, 8vo. In French, *Paris*, 1865, 4to; 1873, 8 tom, 8vo The Tract de gratia et libero arbitrio, pub. in Italian, *Bologna*, 1866, 8vo. The 1st ed. of the "De Gratia," had appeared [*Col.*, 1470—83] in the author's "Opuscula varia." See *Hain*, 2920.

——— **Episcopius** (Sim.) Antwoort op de prœve van Abraham Heidanus. 4to. *Roter.*

Another ed., same place, 1643, 4to.

The above work was sent to the press in September 1642, when Episcopius was seized with his final illness, the preface was in consequence written by his friend Uytenbogaert then in his 87th year.

1642. Requeste presentée au conseil des Pays-bas par le neven de M. l'Evêque d'Ypre, touchant son livre intitulé *Augustinus.* 8vo

——— **Duke** (Fr.) The Fulnesse and Freeness of God's grace in Jesus Christ declared. 4to. *Lond.*

Another ed., *Lond.*, 1655, 4to; a third part *Lond.*, 1656, 4to.

——— **Wynell** (Thos.) The Covenants plea for Infants. 4to. *Oxford.*

Not of any value.

——— **Ben Israel** (Mauane) De Fragilitate humana et lapsu Adami. 8vo. *Amst.*

Very Rare.

——— **Batelier** (J.) Verantwoordinge tegen G. Voet. Remonstrantiche catechisatie. 4to.

——— **Episcopius** (Sim.) Für Prædestinatus, Belgiæ. *Dordrechti.*

Arminian.

——— **Owen** (John). Θεομάχια Ἀυτεσοιλεικε, or Display of the Errors of the Arminians, with a Treatise of Redemption and Reconciliation that is in the Blood of Christ. 4to. *Lond.*

This was Owen's first work, and procured him the offer of the living of Fordham in Essex which he accepted. Other ed., 1643, and 1649, 4to; 1809, 12mo; the last edited by Rev. Sam. Burder. "Owen's display is a barrier against prevailing opinions. Each chapter contains a statement of the Arminian doctrine on the point discussed, with Owen's answer; while at the end of each chapter the Arminian doctrine is more briefly stated in the language of some Arminian writer, and confronted in opposite columns by passages of Scripture."—*Thomson's Life of Owen.*

——— **Cerisiers** (René de) Joseph ou la Providence divine. 8vo. *Paris.*

Dans l'epitre dédicatoire de cet ouvrage, l'auteur se peint comme un homme qui vient d'eprouver un revers de fortune. Il voulait sans doute parler de sa sortee des Jésuites (Barbier)—*De Backer.*

The original French ed. is not in the Brit. Mus. but there is there an English translation under the title "The Innocent Lord," *Lond.*, 1655, 8vo.

——— **Corbet** (Edward) God's Providence; a Sermon preached before the House of Commons, Dec. 28, 1642. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Triglandus** (Jacob.) Medit. de voluntate Dei et gratia universali. 12mo. *Lug. Bat.*

1642. **Ainsworth** (Henry) A censure upon a dialogue of the Anabaptists, intituled A Description of what God hath predestinated concerning man, &c. [by J. Paget ?] 4to. *Lond.*
Another ed., *Lond.*, 1644, 4to.

[1642]. **Held** (Adolph.) Erwehl-und Verwerffung der Menschen. 12mo.

1643. **Pregizerus** (Joh. Ulr.) Propositiones de Indurationes et corruptelis eorum, qui Misericordiam, veritatem et Justitiam Dei impugnari non verentur. 4to. *Tub.*

——— **Sirmond** (Jac.) Prædestinatus, seu Prædestinatorum Hæresis refuta per Authorem vetustum. 8vo. *Paris.*
Other Ed., *Paris*, 1645 and 1648, 8vo; 1677 and 1686, "Opera varia," *Venet.*, 1728, 5 vols, fol. Various conjectures have been formed as to the real name of the author of this work. "Whoever he may have been, he had either access to some documents which have not been seen by the other writers whose works have come down to us, or he added many particulars from his own imagination."—*Dr. Burton.* See De Backer, ii, 559.

——— **Sedgwick** (John) Antinomianisme anatomized, or a glasse for the lawlesse who deny the Ruling use of the moral law unto Christians under the Gospel.

No date. **Goodwin** (Tho., *D.D.*) Three arguments to prove Election upon foresight by Faith.
The author was a high Calvinist Independent divine. He was Lecturer of Trinity Ch., Camb., 1628, Vicar in 1632, and subsepuently became Pastor of an Independent congregation at Arnheim in Holland. He was a member of the Assembly of Divines, and President of Magdalen Coll., Oxford, 1649. He d. 1679. Treatises condensed by James Babb, 1844—8, 3 vols, 8vo.

1643. [**Owen** (John)] Salus Electorum; Sanguis Jesu, or the Death of death in the Death of Christ. 4to.
Other ed., 1647, 4to; 1648, sm. 4to; 1845, 12mo. "This great work was the occasion of much controversy, and it is worthy of especial notice that it was the first production that turned towards Owen the keen eye of Richard Baxter and brought the two great Puritans at length to measure arms."—*Thomson's Life of Owen.*

——— **Bolton** (Sam.) True bounds of Christian Freedom. 12mo. *Lond.*
This ed. not in B. Mus.
Other ed. *Lond.*, 1645, 8vo, and 1656, 8vo. Extracts from this work were pub. *Lond.*, 1835, fscp. 8vo. The author was a Lancashire man, educated at Lincoln, and Brazenose Coll., Oxford, in 1609, being presented to the living of Broughton in Northamptonshire. He was a Puritan divine. Lowndes says of the above work "Excellent, containing much doctrinal and experimental truth."

——— **Petavius** (Dion.) De libero Arbitrio. lib. tres. *Paris*

1643. **Petavius** (Dion.) De Pelagianorum et Semipelagianorum dogmatum historia liber unus. fol. *Paris.*
In vol 3 of best ed. of his collected works, *Venet.*, 1757, 7 vols, fol. Other ed. of works, *Paris*, 1644—50; *Antv.*, 1700. 6 vols, fol.; *Venet.*, 1745, 6 vols, fol.; *Paris*, 1865—67, 8 vols. imp. 8vo.

——— **Recupito** (Giulio Cesare) Opusculum de Signis Prædestinationis et Reprobationis et de Numero Prædestinatorum et Reproborum.
4to. pp. 516, 96. *Neapoli.*
Other ed., *Paris*, 1664, pp. 417, 78, 4to; *Lugd.*, 1681, 4to. A Spanish translation, *Barcelona*, 1687, German, *Bamberg*, 1710, 8vo.

——— **Ribas** (Louis de) Summæ Theologiæ. fol. pp. 452. *Lugd.*
4. De Scientia Dei—5. De Voluntate Dei—6. De Providentia Dei—7. De Prædestinatione et Reprobatione.

——— **Hulsemannus** (Jo.) Orthodoxia prædestinationis ex Ephes. i., 4, &c. *Vitemb.*

——— **Batt** (Timothy) A Treatise concerning the free grace of God the Father and of the love of J. C. 12mo. *Lond.*
Rare.

——— **Hoornbeck** (Jo.) Summa Controversiarum Religionis. 8vo. *Ultrajecti.*
Treats of Arminianism.
Other ed., *Francof.*, 1653, 12mo, 1657; *Ultrajecti*, 1658, 8vo; 1676, 1689, *Francof.*, 1697, 8vo.

——— **Irenæus** (Fran.) Sentimens sur les questions de la Predestination, etc. 8vo. *Paris.*

——— **Saubertus** (Joh.) Liber Providentiæ Divinæ ex Malach. iii, v. 16. 4to. *Norimb.*

——— **Pintherean** (Franc.) Progrès du Jansénisme. 4to. *Caen.*
The author was a Jesuit, who died in 1664.

——— **Spanheim** (Frid.) Disputatio Theologica de Prædestinatione; Præside Frid. Spanhemio, Auctore S. Van. Hamerstede. 4to. *Lug. Bat.*
Spanheim was Prof. of Divinity at Geneva, and Leyden, d. 1649. He wrote a Treatise "De actione Dei hominem indurantis," *Heidelb.*, 8vo.

——— **Arminius** (Jac.) Examen thesium F. Gomari de prædestinat. cum St. Curcellaei vindiciis, quibus suam et Arminii sententiam de jure Dei in creatur. adv. Mos. Amyraldi crimination. defendit. 8vo. *Lug. Bat.*
Another ed., same place, 1645, 8vo. See Walch ii, 537.

——— **Joseph** (Pet. à Saint) Defensio Augustini Hipponensis adversus Augustinum Iprensium, quoad auxilium gratiæ et humanam libertatem. 4to. *Paris.*
He was also author of "Defensio formulæ; Sententia Augustini circa quinque propositiones."

1643. **Rothlebius** (John) Examen et Refutatio Sophronismi. 4to. *Lubec.*

1644. **Palmer** (Herbert, *D.D.*) The Glass of God's Providence. 4to. *Lond.*

One of the assembly of Divines, 1643. Master of Queen's College, Camb., 1644, d. 1647.

——— Urbani VIII. confirmatio constitutionum Pii V. et Gregorii XII. prohibentium quasdam theologor. sententias et opiniones, nec non prohibitio libri, cui titulus est : Augustinus Corn. Jansenii. 4to. *Paris.*

——— Augustinus (Aur.) per se ipsum docens catholicos et vincens Pelagianos. 12mo. *Paris.*

——— **Augustinus** (Aur.) Opera contra Pelagianos. 2 vols. 8vo. *Paris.*

Also in ed. *Lovan.*, 1647—8, 3 vols, 8vo ; *Romæ*, 1652. 4to ; *Par.*, 1617, fol., and 8vo ; *Lovan.*, 1642, 4to.

——— **Petavius** (Dion.) Theol. Dogmatum. fol. *Paris.*

Tom III—Free Will.

——— [**Fromond** (Libert.)] Chrysippus, seu Epistola circularis ad Philosophos Peripateticos, de libero arbitrio. 4to. *Lovanii.*

No date. Concorde de l'Augustin d' Hyppone et de celui d'Ypres.

1644. [**Auvray**] Censura d'un livre que le P. Jac. Sirmond a fait imprimer sur un veil manuscript et qu'il a intitulé ; Prædestinatus. pp. 75. 8vo. *Paris.*

The author was probably Martin Barcos. In Latin, 1645, *s.l.*

——— **De Sales** (S. Franc.) Sentimens sur la Grace.

——— **Senault** (John Franc.) L'homme criminel, ou la corruption de la nature par le peché, selon les sentimens de S. Augustin. 4to. *Paris.*

Other ed., *Paris*, 1647, 4to, and 1648, 4to, 1650, 4to, and 1656, 4to ; *Amst.*, 1665, 12mo ; *Brux.*, 1693, 2 vols, 12mo.

Translated in English by the Earl of Monmouth, *Lond.*, 1650, 4to.

The author was a Jesuit.

——— **Newport** (Will.) The Fall of Man by Sin. 4to. *Lond.*

——— Prognostica Vitæ æternæ, seu verisimilia Prædestinationis Signa. pp. 58. 16mo. *Colon.*

A Roman Catholic work.

——— Recueil de divers Ouvrages touchant la Grace. 4to. *Paris.*

——— **Abarbenel** (Don. Isaac) Enuncians Salutem ; Explicat Prophetias de Redemptione futura. 4to.

——— **Testard** (Paul) L'ajustement du Reformé Misoschisme entre les erreurs du Pelagianisme et du Manicheisme, touchant la grace universelle. 8vo.

1644. **Amyraut** (Moses) Defense de la Doctrine de Calvin sur le sujet de l' Election et de la reprobation. 8vo. *Samur.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— [**Arnauld** (Ant.)] Apologie de Jansenius et de la doctrine de S. Augustin expliquée dans son livre entitulé Augustinus, contre M. Habert. 4to, pp. 430. *S.L.*

"The great Arnauld, that shining ornament of the Gallican Church."—*Bp. Warburton.* Ant. Arnauld died in an obscure retreat at Brussels, in 1692, without fortune and even without the comfort of a servant ; *he* whose nephew had been a minister of state, and who himself might have been a Cardinal. The pleasure of being able to *publish* his sentiments was to him a sufficient recompense. Nicole, his friend and companion in arms, worn out with those incessant disputes, expressed a wish to retire from the field, and to enjoy some repose. "Repose !" replied Arnauld, "won't you have the whole of eternity to repose in ?"—*Dugald Stewart.*

——— ——— Analyse du Livre de Saint Augustin, de la correction et de la grace. 8vo. *Paris.*

Another Ed., *Brux.*, 1675, 12mo.

——— ——— Considerationes sur une Censure prétendue de la Faculté de Théologie de Paris, contre quelques propositions touchant la matiere de la grace et du franc-arbitre, l'année 1560. pp. 31. 12mo.

——— Difficultez sur la Bulle qui défend de lire le livre de Jansenius. 8vo. *Paris.*

No Date. Approbation de la Doctrine de Jansenius donnée par les Théologiens de quelques ordres Réligieux et par l'Archievêque de Philippe.

This work was condemned by Urban VIII. in 1644, and by Innocent X., 23 April, 1654.

1644. A Declaration against the Antinomians and their doctrine of liberty [Nov. 2nd]. 4to. *Lond.*

——— [**Habert** (Is.)] La defense de la foi de l'Eglise et de l'ancienne doctrine de Sorbonne, touchant les principaux points de la grace, contre le livre intitulé Apologie de Jansenius. 4to. *Paris.*

——— **Fisher** (Edw.) The Marrow of Modern Divinity. 8vo.

Other Ed., by Thos. Boston, 1722—26, 2 vols, 8vo ; by Rev. J. Hogg, *Edinb.*, 1780, 8vo. The republication of this work excited a warm controversy in the Ch. of Scotland.

The Author was a Calvinist divine, educated at Oxford.

——— **Gomarus** (Franc.) Opera Theologica omnia. fol. *Amst.*

Containing :—De æterno Dei Decreto—De Divina hominum prædestinatione—Conciliatio doctrinæ orthodoxæ de Providentia Dei—Judicium de primo articulo Remonstrantium de Electione et Reprobatione—Defensio doctrinæ de perseverantia sanctorum. Another Ed., *Amst.*, 1664, fol.,

pp. 786 and 372. This last, but not the 1st Ed., in the Brit. Mus.

The Author was the celebrated defender of the doctrine of Calvin against Arminius, see p. 66.

1644. **More** (Alex.) Dissertationes septem de necessaria Dei Gratia et libero hominis arbitrio. 4to. *Genev.*

The Author was a celebrated French protestant divine, and an opponent of John Milton. He was a Calvinist & the author of "Calvinus, seu Oratio in memoriam ipsius, et ejus Epistola ad Lutheran," 1648.

——— **Geree** (Steph.) The Doctrines of the Antoninomians confuted in answer to Dr. Crisp. 4to. *Lond.*

The Author was a Puritan divine.

——— **Bakewell** (Thos.) Antinomian Christ confounded, and the Lord's Christ exalted, &c. 4to. *Lond.*

The author was a Baker.

He wrote also the "Nut-cracker crackt by the Nutt," 1644, 4to; "A confutation of the Anabaptists," *Lond.*, 1644, 4to; "A Faithful Messenger sent after the Antinomians," *Lond.*, 1644, 4to; and "A short view of the Antinomian Errours," *Lond.*, 1643, 4to.

——— **Alford** (Jos.) The Church Triumphant. 8vo. *Lond.*

A Treatise, showing that the number of the damned is less than that of the Elect.

This is not in the Brit. Mus.

——— Amphilochii Sconiensis, Methodii Palarensis et Andreæ Cretensis, opera omnia quæ reperiri potuerunt, Gr. et Lat., studio R. P. F. F. Combesis. fol. *Paris.*

P. 347, Methodii liber de libero arbitrio. The works of Methodius also appeared in the collections of Bigne, Gallandius and Meurseus, see 1619.

——— **Sherlogus** (Paul.) Vindiciæ Scientiæ Mediæ. 4to. *Lugd.*

——— Reponse à un écrit du sieur Abra de Raconis, qui porte pour titre: Extrait de quelques propositions de Jansenius et de ses sectateurs, condamnées par le Concile de Trente et par les Papes Pie V. et Gregorie XIII. 4to.

——— **Reginaldus** (Ant.) Quæstio theologica, historia et juris Pontificii, Quæ furit mens concilii Tridentini circa gratiam efficacem et scientiam mediam. 4to.

Also issued in French, 4to, and "Theses apologeticæ," on the same subject, published in the same year, 4to.

——— Traduction des éloges donnez à S. Augustin, et mis au commencement du livre intitulé, *S. Augustinus per seipsum docens Catholicos et vincens Pelagianos, &c.* 8vo.

——— **Stolterfoht** (Jac.) Von der Göttlichen Providenz. 8vo. *Lubeck.*

Not in the Brit. Mus

1644. **Wysingius** (Nic.) *S.J.*, Disp. de Hominum Prædestinatione ad Vitam æternam. 8vo. *Diling.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Lorichius** (Jod.) Disputatio de Gratia Dei ejusque effectis. 4to. *Friburg.*

——— **Arriaga** (Roderic de) Disputationes Theologicæ in primam, secundam et tertiam partem D. Thomæ. fol., pp. 672. *Lugd.*

Treats of Divine Grace. The author was a Jesuit.

——— **Wangnereck** (Henry) Theses de Angelorum Prædestinatione ex meritis, prædestinationi gratuitæ SS. Hominum opposita ex mente S. Augustini. *Dilingæ.*

Not in Brit. Mus.

The Author was a Jesuit, who died 1664. He was a Prof. of Theology and Canon Law.

——— **Spanheim** (Frid.) Le Trone de Grace. 12mo. *Leidæ.*

——— ——— Disputatio de gratia universali. *Lug. Bat.*

——— **Hibernus** (Pet. Leon.) Responsionum ad expostulationes recentium quorundam Theologorum contra Scientiam mediam liber singularis. 4to. *Lugd.*

1645. **Curcellæus** (Steph.) Vindiciæ, quibus suam et D. Arminii sententiam de jure Dei increaturas, adversus Mosis Amyraldi criminationes, defendit. 8vo.

See 1675.

——— **Stengelius** (Geo.) Opuscula, Spes et Fiducia, curis judiciisque Dei, erga Homines in hac Vita existentes, etc. 8vo. *Ingoldstadt.*

——— **Goodwin** (John) A Vindication of Free Grace. 4to.

Goodwin was an Independent divine, Rector of St. Stephen's, Coleman St., 1633, but dismissed for refusing to baptise the children of his parishioners promiscuously and to administer the sacrament to his whole parish. He became a warm Arminian; he died 1665.

——— **L[ane]** (S.) A Vindication of Free Grace, in opposition to an Arminian position of Mr. J. Goodwin, etc. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Antonides** (Simeon.) Loci de Providentia Dei.

——— **Wyngaerden** (Joannes) *Resp.* De Gubernatione contingenter et libere agentium, et fortuitorum. 16mo.

——— **Porta** (Ant. à) Les conduites de la Grace sur la conversion des Ames pecheresses. 4to. *Paris*

——— **Henichius** (Joh.) De Libertate Arbitrii, Imprimis de Concursu Causæ secundæ cum primis. 4to. *Rintel.*

——— **Conrius** (Florent.) Abregé de la Doctrine de Saint Augustin touchant

la grace; traduit de son livre intitulé "Peregrinus Jerichuntinus."
(87 p.), 4to. *Paris.*
Not in the British Museum.

1645. **Casaubon** (Meric.) The Original Cause of Temporal Evills.
4to. *Lond.*
See Groome's Dignity and Honour of the Clergy, *Lond.*, 1710, p. 70.

——— **Annat** (Francis) Scientia Media contra Guil. Twissium aliosque defensa.
4to. *Toulouse.*
Not mentioned by Walch, who notes only the 2nd ed., *Par.*, 1662.

——— **Cotton** (John) The Covenant of God's Free Grace. 4to. *Lond.*
A 2nd Ed., by Thos. Allen, *Lond.*, 1659, 8vo; a 3rd, *Lond*, 1662, 12mo; *Lond.*, 1671, 8vo.

——— **Allacci** (Leon.) De libris Ecclesiasticis Græcorum, Dissertationes duæ.
2 vols, 4to. *Paris.*
(Freewill).
Another Ed., *Amst.*, 1648, 4to.
The Author was a native of Scio, keeper of the Vatican library and a celebrated writer. He assisted the gentlemen of Port Royal in their controversy with M. Claude, touching the belief of the Greeks as to the Eucharist.

——— [**Arnauld**].—Seconde Apologie pour M. Jansenius et pour la Doctrine de S. Augustin, expliquée dans son livre entitulé, Augustinus. pp. 426, 4to.
This was written in reply to M. Habert's book, La défense de la Foi de l'Eglise.
The book was condemned by Pope Innocent X, 23 Apl., 1654.

——— **Amyraut** (M.) Dissertationes theologicæ quatuor. 8vo. *Salmurii.*
3.—Doctrinæ de gratia universali.....defensio.
4.—Doctrinæ de gratia particulari, ut a Calvino explicatur, defensio.

——— **Annat** (Franc.) Scientia Media contra novos ejus impugnatores defensa. 4to. *Tolosæ.*
Other Ed., *Paris*, 1662 and 1672.

——— **Lovera** (Ant. la) Responsio ad Theses Apologeticas contra P. Annatum de Mente Concilii Tridentini, circa Gratiam Efficacem et Scientiam Mediam. 4to. *Tolosæ.*

——— [**Barcos** (Martin de)] Recueil de divers Ouvrages touchant la Grace.
This contains, amongst other works, "Une Justification générale et particulière de la Doctrine de M. l'Évêque d'Ypres;" "Une lettre sur la Predestination et la Fréquente Communion;" "Une censure d'un livre intitulé: Prædestinatus: laquelle est uniquemens destinée a prouver qu'il n'y a point eu de Prædestination, et que cette hérésie est un phantôme." The same Author wrote a reply to P. Annat in the five propositions, *Paris*, 1666, 4to. See De Backer, vol 2, p. 7.

——— **Ball** (John) A Treatise of the Covenant of Grace. 4to. *Lond.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.
The Author was a Puritan divine, and a Calvinist, curate of Whitmore, a chapel of ease to Stoke; d, 1640.

1645. **Feydeau** (Matthieu) Catéchisme de la Grace. pp. 45, 12mo.

——— **Bolton** (Sam.) A Vindication of the Rights of Law and the Liberties of Grace.
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Hincmar** (Archbp. of Rheims) Opera duos in tomos digesta cura et studio Jacobi Sirmondi.
2 vols, fol. *Par.*
Vol 1.—The Treatises against Gottleshal; see pp. 21 to 29.
His "Opuscula et Epistolæ," *Paris*, 1615, 4to.

——— **Ward** (John) Sermon: The Goodwill of him that dwelt in the bush; or, the extraordinary happinesse of living under an extraordinary providence.
4to. *Lond.*

——— **D'Abillon** (Andr.) Le Concile de la Grace, ou Reflexions Theologiques sur le second Concile d'Orange.
4to. *Paris.*

——— **Martin** (Ant. de S.) Les conduites de la grace sur la conversion des ames pecheresses. 4to. *Par.*

——— **Clement VIII.**, *Pont. Max.* Scriptum a Sum. Pont. Clemente VIII. Congregationi de Auxiliis exhibitum, in quo Præcipua S. Augustini de Gratia Christi dogmata ipsius Augustini verbis exponuntur. 4to. *Gall. Lat.*
Not in Brit. Mus.
A French translation published the same year, 4to.

——— **Quistorpius** (Nicol.) De libero arbitrio. 4to. *Rostoch.*

——— **Dorschæus** (J. G.) Interpellationis necessariæ ad meditationes Jac. Triglandi in opiniones variorum de voluntate Dei, gratia universali et scientia media, &c., preside J. G. D.
4to. *Argent.*
Another Ed., 1678. There was a continuation of the above, *Argent.*, 1652, 4to.
Dorschæus was author of "De documentis Providentiæ Di-vinæ circa Augustinam confessionem A.D. 1530, exhibitam, *Francof.*, 1654, 4to.
Neither of these books in the Brit. Mus.

1646. **Leigh** (Edward) A Treatise of Divinity in 3 Parts, Decree, Creation, and Providence. 4to. *Lond.*
Other ed., *Lond.*, 1647; 1648, 8vo; 1651, 8vo. Afterwards enlarged into "A Body of Divinity in 10 Books," 1654—62, fol., of which Bickersteth speaks highly, and commends as containing much solid substance. The author was an M.P. expelled from the House for his attempt to save the life of Charles I. by accepting his concessions.

——— **Lavor** (Hen.) Predestination handled and maintained. *Lond.*

——— **Cotton** (John) The clearing of certaine doubts concerning Predestination, with an examination thereof, by W. Twisse, *D.D.*
4to. pp. 290. *Lond.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

1646. **Whitfeild** (Thos.) Min. of Great Yarmouth. A Refutation of the loose opinions and licentious tenets wherewith those lay preachers which wander up and downe the Kingdome labour to secure the simple people.
pp. 99. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Ricardus** (Ant.) [Dechamps (Step.)] Disputatio Theologica de libero arbitrio. 4to. *Paris.*
There seems to have been an edition in 8vo the previous year. At least one appears in the library of Card. Du Bois, and in Lipenius Bib. Realis. Theol., ii, 183. Another ed., *Colon.*, 1650, 12mo. The author wrote another work on this subject the same year.

——— **Coxe** (Rich.) Some mistaken Scriptures sincerely explained, in answer to one infected with some Pelagian errours. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Barnett** (Nehemiah) The Regenerate man's growth in Grace. A Serm. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Burgesse** (Ant.) Vindiciæ Legis, or a Vindication of the Moral law and Covenant against Papists, Socinians, Arminians, &c., in 29 Lectures.
4to. *Lond.*
The author was a Non-conformist clergyman educated at St. John's Coll., Camb., and was ejected from his living of Sutton-Coldfield, Warwickshire, after the Restoration. His views were Calvinistic.

——— **Ross** (Alex., *D.D.*) A Centurie of Divine Meditations upon Predestination, and its adjuncts.
pp. 158. 18mo. *Lond.*
The author was a Scotchman, and an Episcopal divine. He was master of the Free School at Southampton, and d. 1654. He is no doubt the Alexander Ross celebrated by Hudibras; who wrote the account of all religions, and a number of other works. The above work is rare.

——— Propositions extraites de l'Augustin de Jansenius. *Lovain.*

——— Examen Libelli cur titulus est, &c. (last work).
Condemned by a Decree of Rome, 23 April, 1654.

——— **Alting** (Hen.) Loci communes, cum didactici, tum elenctici; Problemata, tam theoretica quam practica; explicatio catecheseos Palatinæ cum vindiciis ab Arminianis et Socinianis.
3 vols. *Amst.*
Also in his works, 1664, 3 vols, 4to. The author was Doctor and Prof. of Divinity at Heidelberg and Groningen. He was a representative of the Palatinate at the Synod of Dort, d. 25 Aug., 1644. The above work is not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Twisse** (Will.) Treatise of Reprobation. 4to.

——— **Mayer** (Leonh.) Disputatio de Providentia Divina actuali.
4to. *Genev.*

1646. **Amyraut** (Moses) Declaratio fidei contra Arminianorum errores.
12mo. *Salmur.*
About this time but without date was published a work entitled, "La créance de Moses Amyrault sur les erreurs des Arminiens," 8vo. See 1660, under which date it is arranged in the Brit. Mus. Catalogue.

——— **Dorschæus** (Joh. Geo.) Dissert. contra Triglandum. *Argent.*
Another ed., 1653; neither in the Brit. Mus.
Also author of "Prolegomena in Augustinam Confessionem, sive de Providentia Dei circa Augustinam Confessionam," *Francof. et Rost.*, 1655, 4to.

——— **Saltmarsh** (John) Dawning of Light, Free Grace, and Sparkles of Glory. 12mo. *Lond.*
The author was an Antimonian divine, d. 1647. "Free Grace, or the Flowings of Christ's blood," republished 1700, 32mo, and 1792, 12mo.

——— **Gataker** (Tho.) A Mistake removed, and Free Grace, etc., in answer to J. Saltmarsh. 4to.
See 1652.

——— **Spanheim** (Frid.) Exercit. de Gratia Universali.
3 vols. 8vo. *Lug. Bat.*

——— **Journal de Mr.** (L. Gorin.) de Saint Amour.....de cequi s'est fait à Rome dans l'affaire des 5 propositions.
Another ed., *Rom.*, 1662, fol.

——— **Cothmannus** (Jo.) Fundament. Christianismi circa doctrinam prædestinatione. 4to. *Rostoch.*
Also author of "Disputatio de certitudine Divinæ Gratiæ," *Rostoch.*, 4to. Neither of these works in the B. M.

——— **Wysingius** (Nicol.) De Scientia et voluntate Dei. *Dilling.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Musæus** (Jo.) De æterno prædestinationis decreto an absolutum sit; nec ne? 4to. *Jenæ.*
Another ed., 1664.

——— **Cloppenburgius** (Jo.) Disputationes septem ad quinque articulos Remonstrantium. 4to. *Francof.*
Another ed., same place, 1656, 4to. See too, his Opera Theol., vol 1 (*Amst.*, and *Francof.*, 1684, 4to); for a disputation concerning the sin of the first man.

——— **David** (Pet.) Summula tractatus de prædestinatione. 8vo.
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Vomelius** (J.) *Resp.* Loci de Providentia Dei disputatio. Præs. J. Cloppenburg. 16mo. *Franekeræ.*
Date in Brit. Mus. Cat. is "1645, etc."

——— **Roeberus** (Paul.) Disputatio de Godeschalci erroribus, olim damnatis. *Vitemb.*
A rare work, of which it is doubtful whether there is a copy in this country.

——— **Habert** (Isaac) Theologiæ Græcorum Patrum vindicatæ circa universam materiam gratiæ. fol. *Paris.*
A recent Ed., *Wirceburgi*, 1863, 8vo.

1646. **Rutherford** (Sam.) Survey of the Spiritual Anti-Christ, opening the secrets of Familisme and Antinomianisme in two parts. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Edwards** (Tho.) Autapologie; or, a full answer to the apologetical narration of Mr. Goodwin, Mr. Nye, Mr. Sympson, Mr. Burroughs, Mr. Bridge, members of the Assembly of Divines, wherein is handled many of the controversies of these times. sm. 4to.

Very scarce. The Author was at first a clergyman of the Ch. of England, but became a Presbyterian and a violent opposer of the Independents; died 1647.

——— **Edwards** (Thos.) Gangrena. 4to. *Lond.*

In several parts in which the author gives a catalogue of the errors, heresies, blasphemies and pernicious practices of the sectaries of his time. Burroughs (J.) wrote a "Vindication against" this work—Alle (Thos.) defended part, *Lond.*, 1646, 8vo; others, such as Bacon (R.), Draper (E.), Goodwin (J.), Lancaster (J.), Maddocks (J.), Pinnell (H.), Ricraft (J.), Saltmarsh (J.), Walwyn (W.), Webb (T.), wrote either for or against the book.

——— **Bulkeley** (Peter) The Gospel Covenant; or, the Covenant of Grace opened [sermons] preached in Concordia, in New England. sm. 4to. *Lond.*

The 1st Ed., rare; a 2nd Ed., *Lond.*, 1651, 4to. The Author was a native of Woodhill, Bedfordshire, was educated at St. John's Coll., Camb., and became an American minister upon being sentenced by Archbp. Laud in 1635. He was one of the first settlers of Concord, Massachusetts.

1647. **Stalham** (John) Vindiciæ Redemptionis. 4to.

——— **Cobbardus** (Pet.) Consideratio rhythmica in laudem Christi gratiæ concinnata, et ex Sancti Augustini doctrina deprompta. 8vo. *Par.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Alting** (Hen.) Exegesis logica et theologica Augustanæ confessionis; cum appendice problematica, unum ecclesiæ reformatæ in Germania pro sociis Augustanæ confessionis agnoscendæ et habendæ sint? Accessit syllabus controversiarum quæ reformatis hodie intercedunt cum Lutheranis [De providentia, De prædestinatione, etc.]. 4to. *Amst.*

Another ed., *Amst.*, 1652, 4to.

——— **Augustine** (S.) Augustinus per seipsum docens Catholicos et vincens Pelagianos. 12mo. *Paris.*

——— **Rabanus** (Maurus) De Prædestinatione Dei adversus Gottescalcum Epistolæ tres. pp. 111, 8vo. *Par.*

The Author was a learned Prelate, Archbishop of Mentz in 847; died 856. Mosheim calls him the great light of Germany and France, because from his fund of knowledge those nations derived principally their religious instructions.

A good Ed. of Works, *Colon.*, 1627, 1636, 6 vols, fol.

1647. **Jansenius** (Corn.) Enchiridion erroris Massiliensium et opinionis quorundam recentiorum. 12mo. *Lovan.*

——— **Naudæus** (Gabr.) Dissertatio ad Beverovicium de Fato et fatali Vitæ termino in Pentade Quæstionum Introphilologicarum. 8vo. *Genev.*

——— **Cardell** (John) God's Sovereign power over Nations, a Sermon. 4to. *Lond.*

Copy in Brit. Mus., 1648.
Also Author of "God's wisdom justified and man's folly condemned touching all manner of outward providential administrations," a serm, *Lond.*, 1649, 4to.

——— **Rivet** (And.) Decretum synodi naturalis ecclesiarum reformatarum gallice initio a 1645, de imputatione primi peccati omnibus Adami posteris. 8vo. *Genev.*

In vol 3 of his Opera theolog., *Roterd.*, 1660, fol. Also joint Author with his brother Will. of "Epistola apologetica ad Criminationes et Calumnias Mos. Amyraldi," *Bredæ*, 1648, 4to, which treats of Arminianism.

——— **Prætorius** (Jacob.) Sündenspiegel über den fall Adams. 8vo. *Berol.*

——— **Lenis** (Vinc.) [Fromond (Leb.)] Theriaca adversus Dion. Petavii et Ant. Ricardi libros de libero arbitrio. 4to. *Par.*

——— **Latermannus** (Joh.) Disp. de Prædestinatione et ordinaria omnes salvandi voluntate. 4to. *Regiom.*

——— **Nierenberg** (Joh. Euseb.) Cogitationes de inæstimabili Pretio Divinæ Gratiæ Christi Sanguine confirmatæ. 8vo. *Lugd.*

Also author of "De Arte Voluntatis libri V; inquibus Platonicæ, Stoicæ et Christianæ Disciplinæ Medulla digeritur," *Lugd.*, 1649, 8vo.

——— **Capreolus** (Jac.) Disputatio de libero Arbitrio. 4to. *Lutet.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.
Another ed. same place, 1647.

——— **Walæus** (Ant.) Opera Omnia. Responsionem ad M. Corvini Censuram in 'Anatomen Arminianismi'—Disputatio de quatuor controversis Remonstrantium articulis, &c. fol. *Lug. Bat.*

Calvinistic.

——— **Hall** (Bisp.) The Peace Maker. *Lond.*

See 1624.

1647. **Bedford** (Thos.) Examination of the chief points of Antinomianisme. 4to. *Lond.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— Consideratio (Rhythmica) altitudinis Consilii divini super salute generis humani, ex sanctissimo et irrefragabili Ecclesiæ Doctore Augustino Episcopo Hipponensi, proposita per D. ac Fratrem Petrum Cobbart. S. Theol. Licentiatum, ejusdemque quondam Lectorem, Abbatiæ Ninivensis Canonicum Norbertinum, Pastorem in Liede Kerche. *Bruxellis.*

——— Poëme de S. Prosper contre les Ingrats, où la doctrine catholique de la grace est expliquée et soutenuë contre les Pelagiens, traduit en François en vers et en prose, avec les vers Latins mis à coté, par Louis Jeane le Maitre de Saci. 4to. *Par.*

Another ed., *Par.*, 1679, 8vo.

——— **Amyraut** (Mos.) Disputatio de libero hominis arbitrio. 12mo. *Salm.*

Another ed., *Salm.*, 1660, 8vo.
Neither in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Francus** (Greg.) Meditatio de genuino sensu absoluti Decreti. 4to. *Francof.*

——— **Jesse.** The Riches of Grace. 8vo.

——— **Poiret** (Pierre) L'Œconomie divine. 7 vols. 8vo. *Amstel.*

Other ed., *Amst.*, 1687, 8vo, 7 vols.; *Francof.*, 1705, 4to, 2 vols. Transl. into English, *Lond.*, 1713, 8vo, 6 vols. "Les Ouvrages de Poiret renferment d'excellentes choses. On est étonné de sa perspicacité à découvrir l'erreur ou à trouver la côté faible de ses adversaries; de son habileté à resoudre les questions les plus subtiles de la métaphysique de son talent à éclaircir les principes les plus obscurs de la théosophie." *La France Protestante.* The author was at first a Cartesian, then a Mystic, and he affected to deduce from the principles of Descartes, a proof of the immediate agency of God, and of spiritual beings on the mind of man.—He wrote also, "Cogitationes de Deo, anima et malo," *Amst.*, 1677, 1685, 1715, 4to.

——— **[Calamy** (E.)] Two Solemne Covenants, made between God and man, viz., the Covenant of Workes and the Covenant of Grace. 4to. *Lond.*

The only copy in the Brit. Mus. is imperfect.

——— **Maupeau** (Hen.) Gratiam Dei non esse semper efficacem, ne necessitate aut determinare voluntatem ad unum, &c. 4to. *Paris.*

Against Jansen. Also author of "De Gratia," *Paris*, 4to.

——— **Genestus** (Joa.) Prolusio Theol. de Morte Christi pro reprobis, juxta mentem D. Augustini. 8vo. *Paris.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

1647. **Veron** (Franc.) Augustinus liberatus à quatuor sophisticis Iprensis Speciebus Novatoris Scholæ ex methodo Augustiniana. 24mo. *Paris.*

——— **Joseph** (Pet. à S.) Le Sentimens de B. F. de Sales touchant les matieres de la Prædestination et de la Grace, &c. 12mo. *Paris.*

Another ed., 1669, 12mo.

——— **Kunadius** (Andr.) Vindiciæ sacræ pro Universali Christi Merito, schedulæ cujusdam Calviniani convitiatoriæ de particulari Redemptione oppositæ. 4to. *Lips.*

1648. **Veron** (Franc.) La Condemnation de la doctrine des Jansenistes par cinq conciles François, huit cens ans il y a, selon les Methodes de S. Augustin; ou Jansenii Gothescalcus Hœreticus, etc. 4to. *Paris.*

The Author was a Jesuit.

——— **Seneca** (Lucius) Seneca's Answer to Lucilius his quære. Why good men, suffer misfortune seeing there is a Divine Providence? 8vo. *Lond.*

This is a translation into English verse by Sir Edward Sherburne, dedicated to King Charles I., during his captivity in the Isle of Wight, who graciously approved and accepted it.

——— **Macedo** (Franc. a S. August.) Cortina D. Augustini de Prædestinatione et Gratia. 4to. *Paris.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.
Another ed., *Monasterii*, 1649, 4to.

——— **Mede** (Joseph) Works. 4to. *Lond.*

Original sin treated. Another ed., *Lond.*, 1661, 2 vols, fol.; *Lond.*, 1672, fol. Mede was one of the most learned and laborious men of his age. He d. 1638.

——— **Prideaux** (John, *D.D., Bp. of Worcester*) Viginti duæ lectiones de totidem religionis capitibus præcipue hoc tempore controversis, prout publice habebantur Oxoniæ in vesperis. 3rd ed. fol. *Oxon.*

P. 32, De Gratia Universali; p. 77, De Perseverantia sanctorum; p. 92, De salutis certitudine; p. 327, De peccato originali. This last was not contained in the 1st ed., which appeared in 1626. The author was Regius Prof. of Divinity, Oxf., and was so profound a divine that some have entitled him "Columna fidei orthodoxæ, et Malleus Hereticorum, Patrum Pater," and "ingens Scholæ et Academiæ oraculum."

——— **[Sirmond** (Jac.)] Historia Prædestinatiana; quibus initiis exorta, et per quos potissimum profligata Prædestinatorum hæresis olim fuerit, et oppressa. 8vo. pp. 89. *Paris.*

——— **Voet** (Gisb.) Disp. selectæ sparsim. 4to. *Ultrajecti.*

Arminian.

1648. **Lupus** (Servatus) De libero Arbitrio, de Prædestinatione et gratia, &c., Edita studio Anthonii Grimbert. 8vo.
Another ed., *Par.*, 1650, 8vo. Lupus was a French Abbot, celebrated for his learning and eloquence, d. about 865.

——— **Petavius** (Dion.) De lege et gratia, libri duo adversus doctrinam Jansenii. 4to. *Paris.*

——— ——— Elenchus theriacæ Vincentii Lenis [Lib. Fromond.] 8vo. *Paris.*

——— **Burgess** (Ant.) The doctrine of original sin asserted and vindicated and practically improved. fol. *Lond.*
Other Ed., *Lond.*, 1656 and 1659, fol. Only the ed. of 1659 in B. M.
The author was an eminent Non-conformist.

——— ——— The true doctrine of Justification asserted and vindicated from the errors of Papists, Arminians, Socinians and Antinomians. 4to. *Lond.*

[1648]. **Couvreur** (Martin) Des sept signes de Predestination. *Liégé.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.
The Author was a Jesuit, Rector of the Colleges of Anvers, Cambrai and St. Omer. See De Bacher, v. 151.

1648. **Ricardus** (Ant.) [**Dechamps** (Step.)] Responsio ad objectiones Vincentianas, qua Vinc. Lenis Theriacam præsentissimum esse venenum demonstratur. 4to. *Paris.*

——— **Rivet** (Andr. et Guil.) Epistolæ Apologeticæ M. ad Amyraldi de Gratia universali. 8vo. *Bredæ.*

——— **Howe** (Obadiah, *D.D.*) The Universalist examined and convicted. 4to. *Lond.*
The author was Vicar of Boston, and d. 1682.

——— **Amyraut** (Moses) Specimen Animadversionum in Exercitat. de Gratia Universali. 4to. *Salmur.*
This is in answer to Rivet's work.

——— **Lyford** (Will.) The translation of a sinner from death to life by the Free Grace of God. 4to. *Oxford.*
The author was Fell. of Magdalene Coll., 1622; Rector of Sherborne, Dorset; see Athen. Oxon., and Fuller's Worthies, ed. 1840, i. 134.

——— **Du Moulin** (Pierre) Eclaircissement des controverses Salmuriennes, ou defense de la doctrine des Eglises reformées sur l'immutabilitiè des decrets de Dieu, l'efficace de la mort de Christ, la grace universelle, &c. 8vo. *Lug. Bat.*

——— **Niedhart** (Carparus) Disputatio Philosophica de libertate voluntatis nostræ in actionibus civilibus et rationi subjectis. *Helmestadi.*

——— **Rothmalerus** (Joh.) Gottselige Betrachtung der Providenz und Vorsorge Gottes. 12mo. *Jenæ.*

1648. [**Sinnich** (Joan.)] Sub pseud. Paulo Erynacho. Trias S. S. Patrum de Gratia Christi et libero Arbitrio. 4to. pp. 739. S. L.
Sinnich was a famous doctor and Prof. of Louvain, and a strenuous defender of Jansen. The three fathers are Augustin against Pelagius, Prosper of Aquitaine against Cassian, and Fulgentius against Faustus.—The author brings what these writers have to say on the various subjects under their several heads. He also gives a very elaborate index. The work is of considerable value.

——— **Garissolus** (Ant.) Explicatio et defensio decreti Synodici Carentoniensis de imputatione primi peccati Adæ. 8vo. *Montalb.*

——— Geneva Restituta, adjecta sunt Alex. Mori Calvinus, Oratio Genevæ habita in qua Vir Ampliss. H. Grotius refellitur, &c. 4to.

——— **Pintherean** (Franc.) La naissance du Jansenisme. 4to. *Caen.*

——— **Guerry** (Antoine) Sigillum prædestinationis nostræ. 8vo. *Paris.*
The author was a Jesuit, and governor of the College of Bourges. He d. 1649. The above work is in French.

——— **Spanheim** (Frid.) Epistola ad Cottierum super Conciliatione controversiæ de Gratia Universali. 8vo. *Lug. Bat.*

——— **Coccejus** (J.) Summa doctrinæ de fœdere et testamentis Dei.
He distinguishes between the covenant before the fall (the covenant of works) and the covenant after the fall (the covenant of grace). The latter covenant embraces a threefold economy. 1. The Economy prior to the law. 2. The Economy under the law. 3. The Economy of the Gospel. The author d. 1669, see p. 59.

[1648]. **Allen** (Rich.) An antidote against heresy, or, a preservative for Protestants against the poyson of Papists, Anabaptists, Arians, Arminians, etc. 12mo. *Lond.*

1648. **Aubuz** (Charles D') De imputatione primi peccati Adæ epistola et carmen propempticum ad A. Garissolium. 8vo.
The author was minister of the Reformed Church at Nérac.

——— **Varallyaj** (Laur. G.) *Resp.* Disputatio... ..de libero hominis Arbitrio, etc. *Præs.* L. Maresio. 4to. *Groninge.*

——— **Porta** (Ant. à) Les Moyens dont Dieu se sert pour faite cette conversion, qui sont les Graces actuelles sufficientes et efficaces. 4to. *Paris.*

1649. Apparatus Molinæ collatorumque adversus doctrinam S. Augustini ad N. Cornet. Auctore Paulo Romano [Joanne Guillebert et Joanne Hamon] 4to.

——— Examen libelli cui titulus est, propositiones excerptæ ex Augustino, Corn. Jansenii. 4to. *Lov.*

1649. **Fitanus** (Petr.) De Imputatione Primi Lapsus Omnibus Adami Posteris. 12mo. *Lug. Bat.*

——— **Rutherford** (Samuel) Disputatio Scholastica de Divina Providentia. 4to. *Edin.*

——— **Hooker** (Thos.) The Covenant of Grace opened, in several sermons. 4to.

——— **Bridge** (Will.) Works. 4 vols. 4to. *Lond.*

Vol 2, Grace for grace, or the overflowing of Christ's fulness received by all saints.

Bridge was a Puritan Divine of Great Yarmouth. He also wrote "Scripture Light," in which he deals with Divine Providence.

——— **Coppin** (Richard) Divine teaching in three parts, etc. Together with a brief discovery of some things concerning election and reprobation, etc. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Twisse** (Guil.) Animadversiones de Prædestinatione, Gratia et libero arbitrio ad Jacobi Arminii Collationem cum Franc. Junio et Jo. Arn. Corvini Defensionem Sententiæ Arminianæ. fol. *Amst.*

——— Sancti Augustini Sententiæ de Prædestinatione et Gratia Dei et de libero hominis arbitrio, ante annos DCCC ex ejus libris collectæ, ac studio et opera J. Sirmondi. 8vo. *Paris.*

This is the 1st ed.

——— **Rivet** (And.) Synopsis doctrinæ de naturâ et gratiâ. 8vo. *Amst.*

Rare.

——— **Veron** (Franc.) L'arrest de condemnation des Jansenistes confirmé, &c. 4to. *Paris.*

——— **Molinus** (Pet.) De Mosis Amyraldi libro adversus Fred. Spanhemium Judicium; seu pro Dei misericordia, sapientia et justitia apologiæ. 8vo. *Roterod.*

Another ed. same place, 1650.

——— **Coccejus** (Joh.) Disputationes XXII theologico-practicæ, de via salutis, hoc est de electione, redemptione, vocatione, etc., præside J. C. 8vo. *Franckeræ.*

——— De l'épistre du Pape Celestin aux Evêques de France, par laquelle et par quelques autre tesmoignages, ou montre qu'on ne peut quitter Saint Augustin en la matiere de la grace, sans peril de tomber dans l'erreur. 4to.

——— **Petavius** (Dionysius) Dissertatio de concilii Tridentini interpretatione et S. Augustini doctrina. 8vo. *Par.*

1649. Lettre d'un Abbé [Amable de Bourzeis] à un President, sur la conformité de Saint Augustin avec le concile de Trente, touchant la maniere dont les Justes peuvent délaisser Dieu, et être ensuite délaissez de luy. 4to.

——— **Higatus** (Ran.) [**Huart** (Ign.)] Lintrivallensis Bernardus; hoc est D. Bernardi tractatus de gratia et libero arbitrio, periodicè dispunctus, commentariis illustratus, S. Augustino, primario gratiæ Christianæ propugnatori, consonus demonstratus, atque à filiorum alienorum depravationibus vindicatus. 4to.

——— **Scharfius** (Joh.) Triga quæstionum theologicarum.....Secunda, num Deus per evangelium omnes homines suo tempore vocaverit. Tertia, an Deus sit causa peccati per se, vel per accidens præside J. S. 4to. *Witteb.*

——— **Calixtus** (Geo.) Exercitatio de peccato originali; præside G. C. 4to. *Helmst.*

——— Litteræ ministerii Regii-Montis respective Tripolanti, ad collegia Theologorum in academiis pro impetrandis censuris super dissertatione Latermanni de prædestinatione aliisque ejus placitis, unà cum apologia Cœlestini Mislentæ. 4to. *Gedani.*

——— **Vellejus** (Greg.) [**Reveau** (Geo.)] De Specimine animadversionum Mosis Amyraldi adversus exercitationes Frid. Spanhemii de gratia universali judicium. 8vo. *Lug. Bat.*

——— **Volscovius** (Mævius) *Resp.* Joh. Micrælio. Disputatio Triangularis de liberi arbitrii Natura et Viribus. 4to. *Gryphis.*

Not in Brit. Mus.

Also Author of "De Virtutibus Naturæ et Gratiæ in conversione," *Gryphis.*, 1646, 4to.

——— **Musæus** (J.) Diss. de æterno electionis decreto, an ejus aliqua extra Deum causa impulsiva detur nec ne? 4to. *Jenæ.*

Another ed., same place, 1664, 1668, 1669, and 1675, 4to. The work is against Arminianism. Also author of "Disput. theolog. de fide quibus annexus discursus geminus de certitudine salutis." *Lips.*, 1678, 4to.

——— **Owen** (John, *D.D.*) Display of Arminianism, being a discovery of the old Pelagian idol Freewill, with the new goddess contingency. *Lond.*

See 1642. The work is Calvinistic.

——— **Collings** (John, *D.D.*) The Spouse under the Apple Tree, or the state of the elect by nature. 12mo. *Lond.*

The author was a nonconformist divine, educated at Emanuel Coll., Camb., and was ejected

from the living of St. Stephen's, Norwich, in 1662. His "Spouse raised," in same volume as above, opens the Doctrine of Redemption.

The copy in Brit. Mus. is imperfect. Part 3 wanting pp. 27 and 28.

1649. **Spanheim** (Frid.) Vindiciæ pro Exercitationibus suis, de Gratia Universali, adversus specimen animadversionum Mosis Amyraldi.
4to. pp. 399. *Amst.*

——— **Rutherford** (Sam.) A Free disputation against pretended liberty of conscience, &c. *Lond.*

——— **[De la Lane** (l'Abbé)] Conditiones propositæ ad examen Doctrinæ de Gratia. *Lond.*

——— [**Bourzeis** (l'Abbé de)] Propositiones de Gratia in Sorbonæ Facultate prope diem examinandæ, propositæ calendis Junii, 1649. 4to. pp. 40.
Not under this author in Brit. Mus.

——— **Wilkins** (John, *D.D.*) Discourse concerning the Beauty of Providence in all the rugged passages of it.
12mo. *Lond.*

Another ed., the 5th, 1677, sm. 8vo; 1680, 8vo; the 7th, *Lond.*, 1704, 12mo. In German, *Basil*, 1672, 12mo. The author was Master of Trinity Coll., Camb., 1659, afterwards Dean of Ripon, Bishop of Chester, 1668, and d. 1672. He was a strict Calvinist.

——— **Muller** (Jo.) Absolutum Decretum. 8vo. *Hamb.*
Other ed., *Hamb.*, 1652, 8vo, and 1695.
"Liber," says Walch i, 461, "qui auctoris diligentiam atque eruditionem ostendit." In his "In Anabpt. error.," 8 and 9, he treats of original sin.

——— [**Prosper**] De la vocation des Gentils, traduit en François avec des reflexions par le P. Antoine Girard.
8vo. *Paris.*

[1649.] A Perfect Cure for Atheists, Papists, Arminians, etc. fol.

——— Veritas et Æquitas censuræ Pontificiæ Pii V., Gregorii XIII., Urbani VIII., super Articulis LXXVI damnatis propugnata constanter ac illustrata à Facul. Theol. Duacena antiquiore et recentiore, &c. fol. *Duaci.*

——— **Sylvius** (Franc.) Antitheses ex ejus et Guil. Estii doctissimis Comment. adversus Bajanos Janseniumque depromptæ. fol. *Duaci.*

——— **Girard** (Ant.) S. Prosper disciple de S. Augustin de la Vocation des Gentils; ou la doctrine catholique de la liberté et de la Grace, &c.
8vo. *Paris.*

1650. [**De Lalane**] De la Grace victorieux de J. C., ou Molina et ses disciples convaincus de l'erreur des Pelagiens et des Sémi-Pelagiens, sur le point de la Grace suffisante soumise au libre arbitre—pour l'explication des cinq propositions, par M. de Bonlieu, Docteur en Théologie.

——— **Frontonis** (Jo.) Antithesis Augustini et Calvini.
This work is extremely rare. Another ed., which is in the Brit. Mus., *Paris*, 1651, 12mo. In it the author puts in parallel, passages of St. Augustine and of Calvin on Grace. Speaking of this work Du Pin in his Biblioth. Script. Eccles. says:—"Le P. General craignants que ce livre ne causat du bruit, en fit retirer tous les exemplaires; mais un des amis du P. Fronteau qui en avoit un, en fit faire une autre edition."

——— **Baxter** (Richard) The Saints' Everlasting rest, or a Treatise of the blessed state of the saints in their enjoyment of God in glory. 4to. *Lond.*

This work has been translated into almost every European language. 2nd edition, *Lond.*, 1651, 8vo; 3rd, *Lond.*, 1652, 4to; 4th, *Lond.*, 1653, 4to; 5th, *Lond.*, 1654, 4to; 7th, *Lond.*, 1658, 4to; 8th, *Lond.*, 1659, 4to; 9th, *Lond.*, 1662, 4to; 10th, *Lond.*, 1669, 4to; 11th, *Lond.*, 1677, 4to; 12th, *Lond.*, 1688, 4to; others, *Lond.*, 1717, 8vo; *Lond.*, 1831, 12mo, Abridged by B. Fawcett, *Bungay*, 1801, 8vo; *Lond.*, 1803, 12mo; *Lond.*, 1807, 12mo; *Lond.*, 1810, 12mo; *Lond.*, 1814, 12mo; *Romsey*, 1816, 8vo; *Derby*, 1819, 12mo; *Edin.*, 1833, 12mo; *Lond.*, *Edin.*, *and New York*, 1856, 12mo; *Edin.*, 1880, 12mo. Abridged by J. Crewdson, *Lond.*, 1832, 18mo. Baxter was the eminent Nonconformist divine. He was a writer 52 years, his aphorisms of Justification being printed in 1649, and his certainty of the World of Spirits in 1691. His separate writings number about 145. He d. 1691.

——— Catechisme de la Grace.
8vo. pp. 40. *S.L.*

This tract is attributed by some to Henry Duhamel, curé of S. Merry, by others to M. de Canmartin, Bp. of Amiens, or Godefroy Hermant, or Mat. Faydeau. It was adopted by the Calvinists without the change of a single word, though written by a Jansenist. It was condemned by Innocent X, 6 Oct., 1650, as "renouvellant les erreurs condamnees par trois de ses Prédécesseurs." "Ce petit catéchisme, est un précis fort exact de l'Augustin de Jansenius. Il a été réimprimé plusieur fois, en Flandre, à Paris, à Lyon; ou l'a fait aussi paroitre sous le titre d'Eclaircissement de quelques difficultés touchant la Grace. Il a été traduit en plusieurs sortes de Langues; et en particulier en Latin, sous ce titre. *Catechismus, seu brevis Instructio de Gratia*; et sous cet autre *compendium doctrinæ Christianæ quoad Prædestinationem et Gratiam.*"—*Dict. des Liv. Jansen.* The translation into Latin was made by Samuel Du Merêts, *Gron.*, 1651, 4to.

——— **Reichelius** (Frid.) Resp. Hartmann de Peccato originali ad II., Art. A. C. 4to. *Franc. March.*

——— **Fuster** (Melch.) De Voluntate Dei. 4to. *Valent.*

1650. La Censure du Catechisme de la Grace faite par le Pope Innocent X, &c. 4to. *Paris.*

——— [**Hermite** (Mart.)] Catechisme ou abregé de Doctrine touchant la Grace divine, selon la Bulle de Pie V, Gregoire XIII, Urbani VIII, Antidote des erreurs du tems. 16mo. *Douai.*
Arnauld replied to this, *Paris*, 1650, pp. 92.

——— **Micrælius** (Joh.) Resp. Petræo, de Divina eorum, quæ Deus non decrevit Præscientia. 4to. *Stætini.*

——— ——— Disp. de absoluta extra Christi et fidei intuitum Prædestinatione minus orthodoxe asserta. *Stætini.*
The same year "*Resp.* Chytræo, De Theognosia triplici," *Stæt.*, 4to.

——— Oogen-Salve voor de blinde Hollanders begrepen in seeckere Missive... ...on.....te doen sien hoe.....de Arminianen de Actien van de..... Staten Generael.....calumnieren, etc. 4to.

[1650.] Censure des sentimens des Jesuites touchant la doctrine et l'autorité de Saint Augustin, etc. 4to.

1650. **Owen** (John, *D.D.*) Of the Death of Christ.
Against the Universal Redemption of Baxter.

——— Responsiones seniorum Facultatis S. Theol. Duacenæ adversus Lucernam Augustinianam sane fumosam ac famosam nempe ab Anonymo objectam contra Veritatem et Æquitatem Censuræ. fol. *Duaci.*
See 1649.

——— Du Chesne. Lettre d'un Theologien à un sien amy en convalescence, contretrois Lettres d'un Janseniste, &c. 4to. *Paris.*

——— **Morel** (Claud.) Les veritables sentiment de S. Augustin et de l'Eglise, touchant la Grace. 4to. *Paris.*

——— **Mayne** (Alph. de) De Initio piæ Voluntatis Dissertatio. fol. *Paris.*

——— **Arnauld** (Ant.) Considerations sur la lettre composée par M. l'Evêque de Vabres, pour être envoyée au Pape en son nom et en celuy de quelques autres Prélats. 4to.

——— **Gomarus** (Fran.) Disputatio Theologica de Divinæ Prædestinationis Hominum objecto. fol. *Amst.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Wirk** (Joh.) Spiegel der Gnade Gottes, gegen den Busfertigen Sünder. 4to. *Zürch.*
Not in Brit. Mus.

——— [**Twisse** (W.)] The Doctrine of the Synod of Dort and Arles reduced to the practice. 4to. [*London.*]
The copy in the Brit. Mus. is imperfect, wanting title page.

1650. [**Bourzeis** (l'Abbé de)] Apologie du Concile de Trente et de S. Augustin. 4to.
Not in Brit. Mus. under this author.

——— **Barcos** (M. de) Augustini et doctrinæ ejus autoritas in Ecclesia. 4to. *Paris.*
Barcos was assisted in this work by Guillebert.

——— [**Bagot** (Jean, *S.J.*)] Advis aux Catholiques pour juger de la bonne doctrine sur la matiere de la grace, et servir de réponse à la premiere partie de la lettre d'un Abbé à un evéque. 4to.
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Dorisy** (Jean) Responses catholiques aux questions proposées dans le prétendu catéchisme de la grâce. pp. 60. 12mo. *Paris.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Loveday** (Samuel) The hatred of Esau and the love of Jacob unfolded. 12mo. *Lond.*

——— **Pynchon** (William) The Meritorious Price of Christ's Redemption. 4to. *Lond.*
2nd ed., 1655, 4to.

——— **Adam** (Jean) Calvin deffait par soy-mesme, et par les armes de S. Augustin, qu'il avait injustement usurpées sur les matières de la grâce, de la liberté et de la prédestination, etc. pp. 771. 8vo. *Paris.*
The author was a famous Jesuit, who died at Bordeaux in 1684. He is the first of modern authors whom Cardinal de Noris has attempted to refute in his Vindiciæ Augustinianæ.

——— [**Bourzeis** (l'Abbé de)] Conferences de deux Theologiens Molinistes sur un libelle faussement intitulé, les sentimens de S. Augustin et de toute l'Eglise. 4to

——— Aur. Aviti Molinomachia, h. e. Molinistarum in Augustinum Jansenii insultus novissimus, viginti octo consonantiarum doctrinæ inde exceptæ, cum art. à Pio V. Pont. prescriptis, compilatione subnixus; totidem vero dissonantiarum contra positione elisus. 4to. *Par.*

——— La saincteté des Saints, prise dans sa source, qui est la Predestination; préchée le jour de la Toussaincts dans une des Eglises de la ville d'Alençon.

——— [**Vavassor** (Francis)] Jansenius suspectus. 8vo. *Paris.*
The author was a Jesuit who died in 1681. L'Abbe d'Olivet (Hist. de l'Acad. i, 322), says that the author "Le P. Vavasseur a été le meilleur humaniste de son temps."

——— **François** (Claude) Les véritables sentimens de St. Augustin touchant la grace. 8vo.

——— Refutation du catéchisme de la grace. 12mo. *Paris.*

1650. **Goodwin** (John) Truth's conflict with error: or Universall Redemption controverted in three publicke Disputations; the first between Mr. John Goodwin and Mr. Vavasour Powell; the other two between Mr. John Goodwin and Mr. John Simpson. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **[Annat** (Franc.)] Disceptatio Catholica de Ecclesia præsentis temporis. 8vo. *Paris.*

——— **Triglandus** (Jac.) Systema disputationum theologicarum in confessionem et apologiam Remonstrantium LXXIV disputationibus absolutum. 4to. *Lug. Bat.*

——— **Lampadus** (Joh.) Prodromus Concordiæ Evangelicæ de solido Prædestinationis Sanctorum Fundamento. 4to. *Marp.*

A Calvinist.

——— **Maresius** (Sam.) Xenia Academica, etc., Et apologia de objecto Prædestinationis. 4to. *Groningæ.*

——— Reponse d'un Ecclesiastique de Louvain à l'avis qui luy a été donné sur le sujet de la bulle pretenduë du Pape Urban VIII. contre le livre de M. Jansenius: 3rd Ed., G. Pierre de Saint Joseph. 4to. *Louvain.*

——— **[Arnauld** (Ant.)] Explication veritable d'un decret de l'inquisition de Rome, portant deffense de deux catechismes, l'un le catechisme de la grace, fait à Paris, et l'autre le catechisme de Douay. 4to.

——— ——— Reflexions sur un decret de l'inquisition de Rome, portant défense de lire le catechisme de la grace, &c. 4to. *Paris.*

——— Lettre d'un Prelat à un Bachelier de Sorbonne, dans laquelle il est traité, si l'on peut sans interest du salut, se départir de saint Augustin dans la matiere de la grace. 4to.

——— **Petavius** (Dion.) Dissertatio posterior de Augustini doctrina et Tridentina synodo. 8vo. *Par.*

——— **[De Sainte-Marthe]** Lettre d'un Abbé à un Evêque, sur la conformité de Saint Augustin avec la concile de Trente, dans la doctrine de la grace. 2nd ed. 4to.

——— Censure des sentimens des Jesuites touchant la doctrine et l'autorité de S. Augustin: faite par l'Inquisition de Valladolid. 4to.

——— **Lane** (N. de la) Dissertatio de initio piæ voluntatis; in qua divinæ ad orandum gratiæ efficacia ex S. Augustini. 4to. *Par.*

1650. **Moyne** (Alph. le) Disputatio de dono orandi, sive de gratia ad orandum sufficiente, adversus libellum de initio piæ voluntatis. 4to. *Par.*

——— **Lane** (N. de la) Notæ præambulæ in libellum Alph. le Mayne de dono orandi. 4to. *Par.*

——— **Lane** (Noel de la) Defense de S. Augustin, contre un sermon presché par le P. Adam, Jesuite. 4to.

——— **Hermant** (Godef.) Defense des disciples de Saint Augustin, contre un sermon du P. Bernage, Jesuite. 4to. *Par.*

——— **Wendt** (Pet.) De voluntate Dei salvifica, exegesis loci I., Timoth. II., 4 quâ sententia tam orthodoxa quam heterodoxa super dicta materia proponitur. 4to. *Argent.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Mauguin** (Gilb.) Veterum Auctorum qui IX. Seculo de Prædestinatione et Gratia scripserunt opera et Fragmenta, cum ejusdem chronica et historica Synopsi, gemina Dissertatione et pacifica operis coronide.

2 vols, pp. 748, 690, 4to. *Par.*

Written against the "Histoire Predestinatienne" of Sirmond.

The volumes are exceedingly rare and exceptionally valuable.

The first, Pt. I. contains:—Opera et Fragmenta in quibus de sola Dei Prædestinatione agitur, viz., Fragmentum Epistolæ Hadriani Papæ I. ad omnes Episcopos per universam Hispaniam commorantes: excerpta ex tribus Rabani Epistolis ad Notingum, ad Eberardum, et ad Hincmarum; Fragmentum libelli et Professionis, quæ Gotteschalcus Rabano in Placito Moguntinensi obtulit; confessio Gotteschalci brevior; Ejusdem confessio prolixior; Lupi Epistola de Prædestinatione ad Hincmarum: Flori Magistri sermo de Prædestinatione; Ratramni libri duo de Prædestinatione ad Regem Karolum Caluum; Joannis Scoti Erigenæ liber de Divina Prædestinatione; Prudentii liber de Prædestinatione contra Joannem Scotum; seu liber Joannis Scoti correctus à Prudentio; Flori Magistri et Ecclesiæ Lugdunensis liber de Prædestinatione contra Joannis Scoti erroneas definitiones.

Part 2 of the same volume contains:—Opera et Fragmenta in quibus de Prædestinatione, verâ Christi gratiâ voluntate Dei, et Morte Christi actum fuit, viz., Fragmenta omnia quæ extant libelli per Gotteschalcum in Placito Moguntinensi oblati; Præfatio libelli seu Collectanei Prudentii ad Hincmarum et Pardulum; Lupi Servati libellus de tribus quæstionibus; Lupi libellus seù Epistola ad Regem Karolum; Ejusdem Collectaneum de Tribus quæstionibus; Remigii et Ecclesiæ Lugdunensis Liber de Tribus Epistolis; Ejusdem libri appendix, seù solutio quæstionis de generali per Adam damnatione; Hincmari Capitula IV. in conventiculo carisiaco furtim edita; Prudentii Tractoria contra quatuor illa capitula; Remegii et Ecclesiæ Lugdunensis de Tenenda immobiliter scripturæ Sanctæ veritate; Canones Concilii Valentini III. contra eadem Capitula; Canones Concilii Lingonensis; Hincmari Epistola XXIV. ad Egilonem Senonensem, Fragmentum annalium Bertinianorum ad Annum 859.

The second vol. contains Manginn's own Commentaries and Dissertations referring to the Predestination controversy.

1650. **Episcopius** (Simon.) Opera Theologica. fol.

2nd and best ed., *Amstel.*, 1678, fol.

In his Instit. Theol., lib. iv., sec. 2, and xviii., cap. xvii., p. 299, he treats De Præscientia futurorum contingentium; cap. xx., xxi. and xxii. p. 304, De Voluntate Dei; sec. 3, cap. vi. p. 356, De Voluntate hominis ejusque libertate; sec. 4, p. 360, De Providentia Dei; sec. 5, p. 403, De Redemptione. In second half of vol., p. 165, Examen Thesium Jacobi Capelli, de Controversiis quæ Fœderatum Belgium vexant. et Satiusne fuerit doctrinam Arminii tolerari quam damnari; p. 198, Tractatus de Libero arbitrio; p. 209, Examen sententiæ Joannis Cameronis de Gratia Dei et libero hominis arbitrio, p. 219. Responsio ad Defensionem Joannis Cameronis, quam opposuit Examini sententiæ suæ; p. 378, Responsio ad duas Epistolas Joannis Beverovicii; p. 288, Paraphrasis et observationes in caput viii., ix., x., et xi., Epistolæ S. Pauli ad Romanos.

Grotius esteemed this work so highly that he carried it with him wherever he went, which, considering its size, must have been somewhat inconvenient. Of our English divines Dr. Hammond is said to have borrowed largely from Episcopius, and Abp. Tillotson has been accounted one of his disciples.

1651. **Luper** (Servatus) De Tribus Quæstionibus liber studio Jac. Sirmondi. pp. 118, 8vo. *Paris.*

——— **Goodwin** (John) Ἀπολύτρωσις Ἀπολυτρώσεως; or, Redemption Redeemed, with a Discourse concerning Election and Reprobation. fol. *Lond.*

A celebrated work.

A new Ed., *Lond.*, 1840, 8vo, pp. 740.

The work is still a standard book on the Arminian hypothesis.

"The ablest defence of genera redemption that ever appeared in an English dress, and may be fairly considered as exhibiting the strength of that cause."—*Dr. E. Williams.*

The work is simply unanswerable on the point of general redemption, and stands untouched, notwithstanding the assault of Twisse and others. It has been said to be one of the most original and argumentative treatises in the English language.

Modernized and abridged by John Bates, 1806, 8vo.

——— **Overall** (John, *D.D.*) Sententia de Prædestinatione. 8vo. *Lond.*

The author was Regius Prof. of Divinity, Camb., 1596, and Bp. of Norwich, 1618.

——— **Whitaker** (Will.) Articuli de Prædestinatione, &c., à Whitakero Lambethæ propositi et L. Andrews de iisdem Judicium. 12mo. *Lond.*

Also in 1694, 12mo; 1696, 12mo; 1700, 12mo; 1720, 8vo; in Engl., 1700, 12mo.

——— **Baxter** (Rich.) The Grotian religion discovered. 12mo. *Lond.*

Another Ed., *Lond.*, 1658, 8vo.

This 2nd Ed., only in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Plaifere** (John) Appello Evangelium for the true doctrine of Divine Predestination. pp. 435, 12mo. *Lond.*

Reprinted in Vilvain Theoremata Theologica, *Lond.*, 1654, 4to; and in Cambridge Tracts. 1719, 8vo.

The author was B.D. of Sidney College, Cambridge.

1651. **Resbury** (Rich.) Some slop to the Gangrene of Arminianism. 8vo. *Lond.*

An attack on John Goodwin.

——— **Vavassor** (F.) Lettre à un amy touchant le Jansenisme. 4to. *Paris.*

——— **Reheboldus** (Elius) Diascepsis de veteri Prædestinatorum hæresi. *Gressæ.*

Also author of Dissertations on Nature and Grace, 1652.

——— **Whitfeild** (Thos.) Extent of Divine Providence. 4to. *Lond.*

Another Ed., *Lond.*, 1653, 4to.

——— [**Sancroft** (Will., *Archbp. of Cantb.*) Fur Prædestinatus, sive Dialogismus inter quendam Ordinis Prædicantium Calvinistam et Furem ad Laqueum damnatum habitus. 12mo. *Lond.*

'The Fur Prædestinatus,' says Dr. Parr, 'was republished and translated [by Rev. B. Nichols, 1847] in consequence of the execution of a Calvinist in Northampton in 1813. He denied the fact at the gallows. He had been encouraged in presumption and self-delusion by a Calvinist Teacher. The Calvinists in Northamptonshire took up his cause, and attacked the judge and jury. Their attack was repelled by the testimony of the offender's attorney, who lived at Wellingborough, and who, in justice to the laws of his country, published the prisoner's private confession made to him in Northampton gaol. One Haffey White, a notorious offender, was hanged at the same time, but did not deny his own guilt!'—*Bibliotheca Parriana*, p. 604.

Other Ed., *Lond.*, 1813, 8vo, and in Dr. D'Oyly's Life of Archbp. Sancroft, *Lond.*, 1821, 2 vols, 8vo, vol 2, p. 175. D'Oyly assumes the tract to be Sancroft's, but see Leibnitz's Theodicca, sec. 167; Hallam's L. H. of Eur., 4th Ed., 1854, vol 3, p. 275; Dr. T. Jackson's Life of John Goodwin, p. 250; Bohn's Lowndes, 2184; Athen., 1859, i., 416, 456; Allibone, ii., 1921. The tract is really a translation from "Den Ghepredestineerden Dief" of H. Statius, see 1619. An Ed. in English, *Lond.*, 1814, 8vo. The Tract alarmed the rigid Presbyterians, and we find the following passage in a book of Tho. Gataker:—"And another of less note in a late Satyrical Libel (for no other is it) entitled Fur Prædestinatus, do therein both grossly abuse Calvin, and jeer the Presbyterian, or Genevian discipline, as such that any debauched person by a hypocritical disguise of contrition and dejection for his loose and lewd courses might easily both delude and elude."

——— [**Arnauld** (Ant.)] Apologie pour les SS. Peres de l'Eglise, défenseurs de la grace. pp. 1069, 4to. *Paris.*

——— **De Bonlieu** [La Lane (Noel de)] De la Grace victorieuse de J. C., ou Molina et ses Disciples convaincus de l'erreur des Pélagiens et des Semi—Pélagiens. 4to. *Paris.*

Not apparently in Brit. Mus., but see Louis Isaac le Maistre.

Another Ed., *Paris*, 1666, 8vo.

1651. **[Sinnich** (Joan)] Spongia Notarum Molinomachiæ.

1651—52. **Maresius** (Sam.) Hydra Socinianismi expugnata.
3 vols. 4to. *Groningæ.*
Another Ed., *Groningæ*, 1657—62, 3 tom, 4to.

1651. **Voisin** (Josephus de) Observatt. ad Raim. Martini Pugionem Fidei.
fol. *Paris.*
Part ii., Diss. ii., cap. 7.

——— **Barlow** (Thos., *D.D.*) A Letter to Mr. John Goodwin concerning Universal Redemption, by J. C.
Not in the Brit. Mus.
Barlow was also author of a tract proving that True Grace doth not lie so much in the Degree as in the Nature. He was a rigid Calvinist. In 1660 he was Margaret Prof. of Divinity, and in 1675 Bp. of Lincoln. He gave 141 MSS. to Queen's College, Oxford, and 78 to the Bodleian.

——— **Beauvais** (N. de) La Couronne de la Grace Victorieuse du Sieur de Bonlieu. 12mo. *Paris.*

——— **[Dechamps** (Etienne)] Le Secret du Jansenisme découvert et refuté.
4to. *Paris.*
The author was a Jesuit.
Another Ed., *Paris*, 1653, 8vo.

——— **Brisacier** (Jean) Le Jansenisme confondu dans l'advocat du Sieur Callaghan. pp. 48, 34, 36, 4to. *Paris.*
The author was a Jesuit, see De Backer, vii., 149, and i., 136; Walch, Biblio. Theol. ii., 953.
There was considerable controversy on this tract.

——— ——— Censure de Monseigneur l'Archevesque de Paris contre le livre intitulè "Le Jansenisme confondu."
This violent attack on Father Callaghan appears to have been called forth by the publication of the celebrated "Vindiciæ Catholicorum Hiberniæ," usually attributed to R. Beling, but which Brisacier says was by Callaghan.
At the end of part 3 is a most abusive satire upon Callaghan by Poncius, an Irish Jesuit.
The above will also be found in "Annales de la Société des soi-disans Jésuites," *&c.*, 1764, tom 4, 4to.

——— **[Annat** (Franc.)] Jansenius de D. Augustino, de Ecclesia Catholica, de Theologica scholastica, ac de Divi Thomæ familia pessime meritus.
12mo. *Paris.*
A work entitled "Jansenius per Heterodoxorum et Orthodoxorum Theses et Antitheses productus et profligatus," is also attributed to Annat by P. Labbe. It was pub. *Paris* [1651], 12mo.

——— Notarum Molinomachiæ Aur. Aviti per Anonymum aspersarum spongia. 4to. *Paris.*

——— Defense des Evêques qui ont écrit au Saint Père, touchant quelques points de la doctrine de Jansenius.
4to. *Paris.*

——— **Salabert** (Joan.) Dissertatio de concordia Libertatis et gratiæ sufficientis. 8vo. *Paris.*

1651. **Toniet** (Pier.) Traité de la Grace.
8vo. *Lyon.*

——— **Dolebeau** (Nic.) Observations sur la lettre d'un abbé à un Evêque, si en la matiére de la grace les lieux du Concile de Trente, du sens desquels on ne convient pas entre les Catholiques, doivent être interprêtez par S. Augustin. 8vo, *Paris.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— Lettre a un amy touchant le Jansénisme, tirée du livre intitulé, 'Jansenius suspectus.' 4to. *Paris.*

——— **Petavius** (Dion.) Dissertatio de adjutorio sine quo non et adjutorio quo. 8vo. *Paris.*

——— **Burghaber** (Adam) Disput. de Prædestinatione et Reprobatione.
pp. 224, 12mo. *Lucernæ.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.
The author was a Jesuit, Rector of the College of Fribourg, and d. at Constance, 1687.

——— **Lamparter** (Henry) De præstantia gratiæ Dei et felicitate hominis eâ donati considerationes xxxviii.
pp. 329, 12mo. *Monachii.*
The author was a Jesuit who d. 1670.
He was Rector of Amberg, Dilingen, Newbourg and Ingolstadt, and finally provincial of Bohemia. *De Backer*, v. 405.
Lipenius calls the author Lampater, and dates the work 1652, i. 744.

——— **Feurbornius** (Just.) Succincta epitome error. Calvinianor., 30 disputationibus comprehensa. *Giessæ.*
Other ed., *Giessæ*, 1654; *Wittemb.*, 1700, 8vo.

——— **Dallæus** (Joh.) Vindiciæ adversus Maresii Epicritam, de Gratia Dei universali. 8vo. *Amstel.*

——— **Textor** (Bertr.) Disputatio Theologica adversus Janseniana dogmata cap. xiii. distincta. 8vo. *Carolop.*

——— **Micraelius** (Jo.) Heterodoxia calviniana de prædestinatione.
4to. *Stetini.*
Other ed. same place, 1657 and 1665, 12mo.

——— **Dorisy** (Jean.) Défense de S. Augustin contre le faux Augustin de Jansénius. 4to. *Paris.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.
The author translated this work into latin under the title "Vindiciæ S. Augustini adversus pseudo—Augustinum Corn. Jansenii," and it was published in 1656, 4to.

——— ——— Refutatio Catechismi, de Gratia et sola doctrina S. Augustini. 12mo. *Paris.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— ——— Refutatio compendiosa ejusdem Catechismi de Gratia ex ipso S. Augustino. 12mo. *Paris.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.
The author of above works was a Jesuit, who d. in Paris in 1657.

1651. **Labbe** (Phil.) Triumphus Catholicæ veritatis adversus Novatores, sive Jansenius damnatus a Conciliis, Pontificibus, &c. 8vo. *Par.*

——— ——— Les cinq propositions censurées, extraites des livres et des chapitres de Jansenius, &c. 4to. (Against Arnauld.)

——— **Magnus** (Albertus) Opera. 21 vols. fol. *Lugd.*

One of the great Schoolmen, Bishop of Ratisbon 1260. d. 1280. Vol. 18, De primi hominis statu, De libero arbitrio, De peccato originali, &c., "De Generatione et corruptione," *Venet*, 1495, fol., see Hain, 517.

——— **Rivet** (Andrew) *D.D.* Opera Theologica. 3 vols. fol. *Roter.*

Vol. p. 1153, De providentia; p. 1156, De peccato primo; p. 1158, De prædestinatione; p. 1161, De causa electionis, p. 1163, De reprobatione, p. 1170, De gratia universali; p. 1173, De libero arbitrio; p. 1178, De gratiæ efficacia; p. 1185, De perseverantia sanctorum, p. 1190, De certitudine salutis.

Vol. 3. p. 745, Disputationes theologicæ XI. in synopses purioris Theol. Prof. Leydensium, p. 798, Decretum Synodi nationalis Ecclesiæ Reform an. 1645, de imputatione primi peccati; p. 828, Synopsis doctrinæ Mosis Amyraldi, et T. Testardi de natura et gratia.

——— **Stookes** (Richard) Truth's Champion. 12mo. *Lond.*

2nd ed. 1673, sm. 8vo, On Christ's dying for all, predestination, election, freewill, original sin, &c. Not in the Brit. Mus.

He was also the author of a Tract "De Attributis Dei."

——— Quinque propositionum de gratia, quas Facultati Theologicæ Parisiensi M. Nicolaus Cornet subdole exhibuit prima Julii anni 1649, vera et catholica expositio juxta mentem discipulorum Sancti Augustini. Kal. Julii. 4to. *Par.*

——— [**Courtot** (Joan.)] Manuale Catholicorum hodiernis controversiis amice componendis maximè necessarium, præcipuè de gratia et de Ecclesiæ authoritate adversùs Molinistas.....contextum, studio Alethophili Charitopolitani. 2nd edition. 8vo.

Not apparently in Brit. Mus.

——— Lucta D. Thomæ contra præmotiones physicas, imo etiam Sancti Augustini contra gratiam physicè efficacem, sub earum media inter extremas expositione F. C. 8vo.

——— **Du Bosc** (Jacques) Jésus Christ mort pour tous, et que cette proposition bien démêlée, peut démêler la controverse au sujet de la grace. 8vo. *Par.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

1651. **Bachmann** (Conr.) Beneficium Redemptionis. 12mo. *Francof.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Scharfius** (Joh.) De Gratia Dei, de Gratia Redemptionis, de Gratia Vocationis, etc. 4to. *Witteb.*

——— **Vorstius** (C.) Klaer ende onpartijdigh bericht von de vijff strijdige poincten aengaende de Prædestinatie Godes, *&c.* 8vo.

1652. La Doctrine du Livre intitulée Cornelii Jansenii Iprensis Augustinus, condamnée par les definitions des Papes, &c. 4to. *Cologne.*

——— **Rebholdus** (Elias) De Natura et Gratia, contra Amyraldum. 4to. *Giessæ.*

——— **Charleton** (Will, *M.D.*) The darkness of Atheism, dispelled by the light of Nature, a physico-theological treatise. 4to. *Lond.*

P. 94, The general providence of God; p. 157, The especial providence of God; p. 257, Liberty of will; p. 302, Of fate; p. 328, Liberty of Will, Fortune and Fate conciliated. Another ed., *Lond.*, 1655, 4to. The writer was physician to K. Charles I, and Charles II. He was educated at Magdalen Hall, Oxford, where he was noted for his attainments in logic and philosophy. Chosen Pres. of the College of Physicians in 1689. To the above work is prefixed a dedication in Latin to Dr. Francis Prujean, dated 1st Aug., 1651, though in the printed copies it is by mistake 1641. There is much learning and reading in the book, and some parts are treated with the utmost skill and exactness, more especially that famous question whether the term of man's life be mutable or fixed. Upon this point the author tells a very remarkable story of a godly physician in the Parliament's Army, who being a rigid Fatalist, gave out his prescriptions by lots, and so left his patients to take their chance, though he took his fees.

——— **Maldonat** (Joan.) De libero arbitrio et Gratia, de Peccato originali, de Providentia, etc. fol. *Rothorw.*

Also in his Opera varia theologica, *Paris*, 1677, fol. The author was a learned and distinguished Jesuit, who d. 1583.

——— Lettre a Monseigneur l'Evesqie de.....povr la Defense de qvelques Propositions de la Predestination et de la Grace efficace avancées. 4to. *Paris.*

——— Toute la terre pour la grace suffisante.

——— **Pawson** (J.) A Brief Vindication of Free Grace relating to several positions asserted by J. Goodwin in his late book entitled "Redemption Redeemed."

1652. **Resbury** (R.) The Lightless starre, or Mr. J. Goodwin discovered a Pelagio-Socinian, with an answer to his letter entitled "Confidence dismounted," etc. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Fouler** (Will.) Truth's Vindication of Election and Reprobation. 12mo. *Lond.*

The Author was Minister at Ingworth, Norfolk.

——— **Goodwin** (John) Expos. of the 9th Chapter of the Romans. 4to. *Lond.*

A new ed. with Pref. by Thos. Jackson, *Lond.*, 1835, 8vo. Goodwin maintained the Arminian view. He contends that in this Chapt. St. Paul does not deal with any personal election or reprobation, neither does he mention Isaac or Jacob as examples of an absolute and unconditional election of individuals to eternal life, but as types of believers in Christ. Esau, he also contends is not addressed as an absolute reprobate consigned to perdition by virtue of an everlasting decree totally irrespective of his conduct, but as a type of the unbelieving posterity of Abraham, who were cast off by God, and appointed to destruction by His just judgment.

——— ——— Eiphnomaxia; The Agreement and Distance of Brethren. 4to. *Lond.*

Another ed., *Lond.*, 1835, 8vo.

The work treats of Election and Reprobation; The Grace of God; The Liberty or Power of the Will; and the Perseverance of the Saints.

——— **Morus** (Alex.) Victoria Gratiæ, de Gratia et libero Arbitrio, contra Petavium. 4to. *Medeob.*

This work is rare.

——— **Burgesse** (Ant.) Spiritual Refinings; or a Treatise of Grace and Assurance. fol. *Lond.*

Another ed., *Lond.*, 1658, fol.

The author was a Nonconformist, and a minister of the Assembly of Divines. His works were much sought after at one time and are now scarce.

——— **Moraines** (Ant.) Anti-Jansenius; hoc est, Selectæ Disputationes de Hæresi Pelagiana et Semi-pelagiana. fol. *Paris.*

Lipenius, Bibl. Real.Theol. ii. 462, gives the date as 1651.

——— **Titius** (Gerh.) An homo nondum renatus polleat Libero Arbitrio. 4to. *Helmst.*

Also author of a treatise "De Merito Christi," *Helmst.*, 1663, 4to. And "Disp. de pacto legali et evangelico Dei cum protoplastis," *etc.*, *Helmst.*, 1659.

——— **Davis** (John) A Divine Psalme or Song, wherein Predestination is maintained. 4to. *Lond.*

Very rare.

Another ed., *Lond.*, 1655.

——— **Desmarets** (Sam. de) Les Jansenistes reconnus Calvinistes. 12mo. *Paris.*

——— **Grotius** (Hugo) Discourses of God and His Providence, etc., Transl. into English by C. B. 8vo. *Lond.*

Another ed., *Lond.*, 1653, 12mo.

1652. [**Arnauld** (Ant.)] L' innocence et la verité défeudues contre les calomnies et les faussetez des Jesuites, et contre le livre du P. Brisacier intitulé Le Jansenisme confondu, par M. Callaghan. 4to.

——— **Wendelinus** (Marc. Fred.) Exercitationes Theologicæ vindices pro suâ Theologiâ contr Joh. Gerhardium. 4to. *Cassellis.*

Ex. xxx. p. 444.

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Zuingerus** (Theod.) Theatrum Sapientiæ cœlestis ex Calvini Institutionibus repræsentatum. 4to. *Bas.*

——— **Calovius** (Abr.) Socinismus profligatus disputationibus. 4to. *Witteb.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

The author was a Prussian divine, Prof. of Theology at Wittemberg, d. 1686.

——— **Gataker** (Tho.) Antinomianism discovered and confuted. *Lond.*

The author was preacher at Lincoln's Inn, 1601, and Rector of Rotherhithe, 1611. He was one of the most learned critics of his day, and author of the "Treatise of the nature and use of Lots," *Lond.*, 1616, 1619, 1627, 4to, which created a considerable stir at the time of its publication. He was a member of the Assembly of Divines, 1642. Morkof speaks of him as "Vir stupendæ lectionis magnique judicii."

———[**Bourzeis** (L'Abbé de)] Saint Augustin victorieux de Calvin et de Molina, ou réfutation d'un livre intitulé: Le Secret du Jansénisme. 4to. *Paris.*

Not under this author in Brit. Mus.

———[**Brisacier** (Jean)] Les Jansenistes reconnus Calvinistes par Sam. De Marêt, dans sa version latine du Catechisme de la Grâce des Jansenistes. 12mo. *Paris.*

Not apparently in the Brit. Mus.

Another ed., *Paris*, 1662, 12mo.

——— **Vatier** (Ant.) St. A. Augustini de Correptione et Gratia ad Valentinum, et cum illo Monachos, liber explicatus et notis illustratus, etc. 8vo. *Paris.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Hamel** (J. B. du) Philosophia moralis christiana. 3 vols. 8vo. *Andegavi.*

Vol. 2, De libero arbitrio; vol. 3, De concursu divino, juxta principia sanctorum Augustini et Thomæ.

——— **Tomass** (Andr. di S.) L'Incertezza accertata della Predestinatione dell' Huomo. 12mo. *Genev.*

——— **Preston** (John, *D.D.*) Theses de Gratiæ convertendis irresistibilitate. 8vo.

In Engl., 1654, 4to.

The author was Fell. of Queen Coll., Camb., and Chaplain to Prince Charles. He became later

preacher in Lincoln's Inn, and Master of Emanuel Coll. He was a zealous calvinist, and a popular writer, being termed by Echard "The most celebrated of the Puritans."

1652. **Anglus** (Thos.) *pseud.* **White** (Thos.) Mens Augustini et gratia Adami; opus hermeneuticum, ad conciliationem gratiæ et liberi arbitrii in via Digbæana accessarium. 12mo.
Another ed., *Colon. Agrip.*, 1659. The ed. of 1652, which is in the Brit. Mus. is very rare.

——— **Ward** (Seth.) A philosophical essay towards an eviction of the Being and Attributes of God. 12mo
5th ed., *Oxford*, 1677, 8vo. The author was Bp. of Exeter and Salisbury.

——— **Stengelius** (Car.) Thesaurus Biblicus in Cap. iii, Genesis de lapsu primorum parentum. 8vo. *Ingolst.*

——— [**Hermant** (God.)] Fraus Calvinistarum retecta: sive catechismus de gratia ab hæreticis Sam. Maresii corruptelis vindicatus: per Hieron. ab Angelo Forti. 4to. *Par.*

——— **Sebille** (Alex.) Interpres Thomisticus D. Augustini et SS. Patrum de libero arbitrio, adv. Corn. Jansenii doctrinam, prout defensatam in Theriaca Vincentii Lenis. pp. 424, fol. *Mogunt.*

——— [**Annat** (Fr.)] Augustinus a Baianis vindicatus libris VIII. quibus ostenditur doctrinam Jansenianam longè distare a doctrina S. Augustini. 4to, pp. 915. *Par.*

——— **Ribadeneira** (Gaspar de) Tractatus de Prædestinatione Sanctorum et reprobatione impiorum. 4to, pp. 542. *Compluti.*
A Roman Catholic writer.

——— **Culverwell** (Nathaniel) An elegant and learned discourse on the Light of Nature. 4to. *Lond.*
The White Stone—a Treatise of assurance.
Another ed., *Lond.*, 1654, 4to; 1661, 4to; edited 1867, by F. Brown, *Edinb.*, 1857, 8vo; an ed. in Latin, *Oxon.*, 1669, 4to.

——— **Annat** (Franc.) De incoacta libertate. 4to. *Romæ.*

——— **S. Joseph** (Petr. à) Consensus orbis de gratiâ sufficiente. 12mo. *Par.*

——— **Belley** (L'Evêque de) Epitres théologiques sur la matière de la prédestination, de la grace, et de la liberté. 2 vols, 8vo. *Paris.*

——— **Sperlingius** (Joannes) De Natura, Anima Mundi, Fortuna, Fato et Casu. 4to.

——— **Whitfield** (Tho.) The Doctrines of the Arminians and Pelagians truly stated and clearly answered. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Cellarius** (Balth.) De Libero arbitrio. *Helmst.*
Not in the Brit. Mus

1652. **Maresius** (Sam.) Fœderatum Belgium orthodoxum. 4to. *Groning.*

——— **Spanhemius** (Frid.) Syntagm. disputat. theologicar. 4to. *Genev.*
Pt. 1, p. 178; Diss. de Prædest.: de gratia Univers.; de lib. arb; de persev. sanct.

——— **Marande** (Sieur de) Le Theologien François dans lequel selon l'ordre des l'escole, est traicté des principes et proprietés de la theologie; des attributs, de la vision, science, predestination et volonté de Dieu, &c. 2 vols, fol. *Par.*
This is the 3rd and best ed.
Another ed., *Paris*, 1662.

——— **Camus** (Jean Pièrre) Epistres théologiques sur les matiéres de la Prédestination de la Grace, de la liberté, &c. 2 vols, 8vo. *Par.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.
The date in Lipenius is 1651.

——— **Scharfius** (Joh.) Resp. Geblero de Prædestin. 4to. *Witteb.*
The author was a Lutheran.

1653. **Love** (Christ.) a Treatise of Effectual calling. Sm. 8vo. *Lond.*
Another ed., 1658, sm. 4to. Also in vol 1 of Works, *Dalry*, 1805, 8vo.
"A plain, impressive, evangelical and holy writer."—*Bickersteth.*
The author was a Presbyterian divine, executed for plotting against Cromwell.

——— **Kendall** (Geo.) Theocratia; or, a vindication of the doctrine commonly received in the Reformed Churches concerning God's intention of special Grace and favour to his Elect. fol. *Lond.*
Against J. Goodwin.
The author was a Calvinist divine, Preb. of Exeter and Rector of Blissland, Cornwall, died 1663.

——— Le Poison caché sous le Jansénisme; avec le contre-poison. 12mo. *Metz.*

——— Congregationum de auxiliis Divinæ gratiæ habitarum coram Clemente VIII., Paulo V. acta sincera.
"Ces Actes ont été faussement attribués à François Pena et à Thomas Lemoz. Ils furent déclarés aprocryphes, sans autorité, et tout-à-fait indignes de foi, par le Pape Innocent X., le 23 Avril, 1654."—*Dic. Lib. Jans.*, *i.*, 148.

——— **Vavassor** (Franc.) Dissertatio de libello supposititio. 8vo. *Paris.*
The author was a Jesuit.

——— **Goetting** (Matthias) *Resp.* Disputatio de peccato originali. 8vo.

——— **Drexelius** (Hier.) Jobus, seu Theatrum Providentiæ Divinæ. 12mo. *Monach.*
Other ed., *Neoburgi.*, 1655, 12mo; *Antv.*, 1655, 16mo. This last the only one in the Brit. Mus. The 1st ed. is extremely rare.

1653. **Hogelande** (Corn. Ab.) De Prædestinatione et Libero Arbitrio.
8vo. *Amst.*
Another ed., *Lug. Bat.*, 1676, 12mo.
Also author of "Cognitiones, quibus Dei Existentia demonstratur," *Leidæ*, 1676, 12mo.

——— **Augustinus** (Tho.) Libertatis et Gratiæ Christianæ defensio, contra Calvinam et Pelagium in Corn. Jansenio redivivos. pp. 602, 4to. *Par.*
Another ed., *Par.* 1696.
The author was probably John Bagot, a Jesuit, successively Prof. of Philos. in several colleges in France.
Not under Augustinus in Brit. Mus.

——— **Morton** (Thos.) Ezekiel's Wheels.
8vo. *Lond.*
This work contains meditations on God's Providence.
The author was successively Bishop of Chester, Lichfield and Coventry, and Durham, and died in 1659, aged 95. He was one of the 12 bishops who joined in protesting against all the proceedings of the Parliament since the 27 Dec., 1641.
The work is very scarce.

——— **Macedo** (F.) Mens divinitus inspirata sanctissimo.....Innocentio..... et mens divi Augustini illustrata de duplici adjutorio gratiæ sine quo non et quo. 4to.

——— **Quendstedt** (Joh. And.) *Resp.* Bünsovio, πληροφορία Lutherana.
4to. *Witteb.*
(The certainty of salvation).
Also "*Resp.* Clerico, De Deo ejusque Cognitione," *Witteb.*, 1653, 4to.

——— **Claserus** (Dav.) Theologia naturalis de Deo et attributis Divinis.
4to. *Magd. et Lips.*

——— **Bail** (Lud.) De Beneficio Crucis, seu Articuli disputati de Gratia.
8vo. *Paris.*

——— **Yves** de la Necessité.
8vo. *Paris.*

[1653]. **Schaller** (Jac.) De Amissione Gratiæ et Statu peccati. 4to. *Argent.*

1653. **Deker**, Deuxième défense de la Constitution.
Not in the Brit. Mus.
Another ed., *Louvain*, 1707, 8vo.

——— **[De La Lane and Girard]** Distinction abrégée des cinq Propositions, qui regardent la matière de la Grace laquelle a été présentée en Latin à SS., par les Théologiens qui sont à Rome pour la défense de la Doctrine de S. Augustin. 4to.

——— Ecrit à trois Colonnes.

——— Emunctorium lucernæ Augustinianæ, quo fuligines à quibusdam aspersæ emunguntur: C'est à-dire à la lettre, Mouchettes de la lampe de S. Augustin, pour empêcher la fumée dont certaines gens tâuchent de l'obscurcir.

1653. **Elton** (Edward, *B.D.*) The Great Mystery of Godlinesse opened, being an Exposition upon the whole of the 9th chapter of the Romans. fol. *Lond.*
"The style is plain and homely, but the matter is of the choicest kind. This old folio is like an old skin bottle, with a rough exterior, but filled within with the product of the rarest vintage. Such books as these we never tire of reading."—*Spurgeon.*

——— **Twisse** (Will.) The Riches of God's love unto his Vessels of Mercy consistent with his terrible hatred or Reprobation of the Vessels of wrath, &c.
fol. *Oxf.*
Said by some to be "The mightiest man in these controversies that his age produced," see Clarke's lives. Wordsworth's Eccles. Biog., Joseph Mede's works.

——— **Owen** (John) Diatriba de Justitia Divina. Sm. 8vo. *Oxon.*
An English version appeared about the same time, and has been several times reprinted.

——— **Amyraut** (Moses) Theses de Peccato in Spiritum Sanctum.
4to. *Salm.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Hoepfuerus** (Hen.) Disputationes duodecim de Justificatione Hominis Peccatoris coram Deo; cura Jo. Ben. Carpzovii senioris. 4to. *Lips.*
Another ed. with Preface by Wernsdorfius, *Lips.*, 1728, 4to.
An able work.

——— **Blake** (Tho.) Vindiciæ Fœderis; or, a Treatise of the Covenant of God with mankinde. 4to. *Lond.*
Best ed., 1658.
The author was a Puritan Divine.

——— **Courtot** (Jean.) Remonstrance chrestienne aux Pères de l'Oratoire de Paris, sur leur prétendue reconciliation avec les Jesuites, touchant la doctrine.
4to.
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— Doctrina Molinistarum circa gratiam sufficientem. 4to.

——— **Annat** (Fran.) Informatio de quinque Propositionibus ex Jansenii Theologia collectis, quas Episcopi Galliæ Romano Pontifici ad Censuram obtulere.
4to. pp. lxx. and 178. *Paris.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **A[nnat]** F(ranc.)] Jansenius a Thomistis, Gratiæ per seipsam efficacis defensoribus condemnatus.
4to. pp. 57. *Paris.*
Two letters were written in reply to Annat by Noel de la Lane, to which letters Annat wrote a response.

——— **Franciscus** (P.) Mens divinitus inspirata Innocentio Papæ X super quinque propositiones Jansenii: et mens Augustini de duplici adjutorio gratiæ. 4to. *Lond.*

1653. **Koerner** (Valentine) Asserta theologica de trinitate, incarnatione, gratia et ejus efficacia. fol. *Pambergæ.*
The author, a Jesuit, was Prof. of Theology at Bamberg, and Rector of the College at Spire. He died in 1658, De Bacher v, 378.

——— **Whitfield** (Tho.) A treatise tending to shew that God may have a Hand in the unjust actions of sinful men. 4to. *Lond.*
Not in Brit. Mus.

——— Innocentii X., constitutio, qua declarantur et definiuntur 5 propositiones in materia fidei. 4to. *Paris.*

——— **Ottius** (Jo. Hen.) Oratio de causa Jansenistica una cum scholiis et indice præcipuorum librorum Jansenisticorum. 8vo. *Fig.*
See also as to original sin, his Anal. ad an. 1525, sec. 16.

——— Innocentii Papæ X brevissima V propositionum in varios sensus distinctio, apertaque de is, tum Calvinistarum ac Lutheranorum, tum Pelagianorum ac Molinistarum, tum S. Augustini, ejusque discipulorum, sententia : autoribus Nat. de la Lane, Arnauld et Nicole. 4to.

——— Bulle de Innocent X. ou sont définies et déterminées cinq propositions en matière de foy. 4to. *Par.*

——— Constitution de Innocent X du dernier Mai, 1653, par laquelle sont declarées et définies cinq propositions en matière de foy, &c. fol. *Angers.*

——— Quinque propositiones ab Innocentio X damnatæ, et propositiones Jansenii damnatis contrariæ. 4to.

——— **Piccart** (J. A.) De gratia Justifica. 4to. *Argent.*

——— Poëme sur la grace, selon les sentimens de S. Augustin expliquez par M. le Moyne. 4to. *Paris.*

1654. **Dechamps** (Steph.) De hæresi Janseniana ab Apostolica sede merito proscripta. fol. *Paris.*
Another ed. *Paris*, 1728, fol. The author also wrote "Arcana Jansenismi," in reply to the objections of Fromond, and a Dissertation on Free-Will, see Walch, Bibl. Theol. ii, 952.

——— **Owen** (John) Doctrine of the Saint's Perseverance explained and confirmed. fol. *Oxf.*
Written against Goodwin.

——— **Kendall** (Geo.) Sancti Sancti ; or the common doctrine of the Perseverance of the Saints .....vindicated. fol. *Lond.*

——— **Tayler** (Franc.) Concerning Election by Free Grace. *Lond.*

——— **Leigh** (Edw.) System or Body of Divinity. fol. *Lond.*
The controversies between the Calvinists and Arminians are discussed in this volume.

1654. **Grimandet** (Franc.) The Power of Redemption pub. by Amyrault or Peter Ærodius. *Angers.*

——— **Hobbes** (Thos.) Letter about Liberty and Necessity. 12mo. *Lond.*
Other ed., 1656; *Lond.*, 1670, 12mo; with obs. by the Bp. of Lincoln, 1677, 24mo. The author was the celebrated philosopher of Malmesbury, best known for his "De Cive," and his "Leviathan." He d. 1679, aged 92. The above letter elicited a Controversy with Archbp. Bramhall and Bishop Laney. Hobbes pub. an account of his controversy with the former in 1656, 8vo ; and of that with the latter in 1670, 4to, see 1684. Ed. by P. Mallett, 1812, cr. 8vo, of which only 250 copies printed.
The collected works of Hobbes in 11 vols, ed. by Sir W. Molesworth, *Lond.*, 1839, vol 5 contains "The questions concerning liberty, necessity, and chance clearly stated and debated between Dr. Bramhall, Bishop of Derry, and Thos. Hobbes of Malmesbury." Hobbes was also attacked by Dr. Seth Ward, afterwards Bp. of Salisbury. Tenison, afterwards Archbp. of Canterbury, gave a summary of Hobbes's principles, with a judicious confutation of them in a book called "The Creed of Mr. Hobbes examined," published in 1670. The famous Earl of Clarendon also wrote "A brief view and survey of the dangerous and pernicious errors to the church and state in Mr. Hobbes's book intituled *Leviathan.*" This was published in 1676. Bps. Parker and Cumberland and Mr. Tyrrel have also distinguished themselves in this controversy.

——— **Loeff** (Dor.) Defensio brevis constitutionis Innocentii X. de quinque Propositionibus Jansenii auctore Alexio Philo—Romæo. 4to. *Leodii.*
The author was a Jesuit who d. 1685.

——— [**Labbe** (Phil.)] Bibliotheca Anti-Janseniana, sive Catalogus suorum eruditorumque scriptorum qui Corn. Jansenii et Janseniorum Hæreses, errores ineptiasque oppugnarunt. 4to. pp. 104. *Paris.*

——— Judicium Synodi nationalis reformatorum ecclesiarium Belgicarum habitæ Dordrechti ann. 1618 et 1619 cui plurimi Theologi reformatarum Ecclesiarum interfuerunt de quinque doctrinæ capitibus in Ecclesiis Belgicis controversis. 8vo.

——— **Pierce** (Thomas *D.D.*) A correct copy of some Notes concerning God's decrees, especially of reprobation. *Oxf.*
There was another edition in 1657.
The author was Preb. of Canterbury and Lincoln, Pres. of Magdalene Coll., 1661 ; Dean of Salisbury, 1671, and d. 1691. A great antagonist of Baxter. He was a man of extraordinary learning and assisted Richard Walton in editing the London Polyglott Bible.

——— Apologia novissima pro Sancto Augustino, Jansenio, et Jansenistis contra Pontificem et Jesuitas. *Groningæ.*

——— [**Sinnich** (Joan.)] Homologia Augustini Hypponensis et Augustini Yprensis de Deo omnes salvare volente, &c. *Lovanii.*
P. Bivero replied to this work, which was condemned by Innocent X, 23 April, 1654.

1654. Réponse au Père Annat, Provincial des Jésuites, touchant les cinq Propositions attribués à M. l'Evêque d'Ypres [par Arnauld and Nicole.] 4to.
Condemned by Innocent X, 28 April, 1654.

——— Theses Theologicæ de Gratiâ.
Condemned at Rome, 4 Dec., 1674.

——— The Doctrine of the Saints Perseverance explained and confirmed.

——— **Adam** (Jean) Le Tombeau du Jansénisme, ou le Nouveau Party destruit par Sainct Augustin et la Bulle du Pape Innocent X. 4to. *Paris.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.
The author was a Jesuit.

——— **Calovius** (Abrah.) Discussio scandalosi tractatus *Christ. Drejeri* de Deo peccati causa per accidens. 4to. *Witteb.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Vives** (Hier.) De Primatu Divinæ Libertatis, &c., contra scientiam Mediam. *Valent.*

——— **Crocius** (Jo.) Anti-Becani. 2 vols. *Marp.*

——— **Crandon** (John) Mr. Baxter's aphorisms exorcised and authorized. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Towne** (Robert) A re-assertion of grace. 4to. *Lond.*

——— [**Annat** (Franc.)] Cavilli Jansenianorum. 4to. pp. 63. *Paris.*
To this Noel de la Lane wrote two replies entitled "Défense de la Constitution," &c., 1655, 4to. Trans. into French, *Par.*, 1654, 8vo, and 4to.

——— **Ferrier** (Jean) Le Jansenisme condamné par la Bulle d'Innocent X, ou refutation d'un libelle dans lequel les Jansenistes soutiennent que les Propositions de Jansenius n' ont par été condamnées dans le sens qu'ils les defendent. 4to. *Toulouse.*
A Jesuit, also author of "Advertissement à M. Arnauld," *Toul.*, 1655, 4to, and a "Response à une lettre de M. Arnauld." *Toul.*, 1656, 4to.

——— **Du Bosc** (P.) Le triomphe S. Augustin, et la deliverance de sa doctrine, ou l'on voit la condemnation des cinq propositions des Jansenistes. 4to. *Paris.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Preville** (Sieur de) [le P. Pinthereau, Jesuit] La naissance du Jansenisme découverte. 4to. pp. 161. *Lov.*

1654. **Scharfius** (Joh.) Disputatio solemnis de gratia redemptionis, præcipué verò de amplitudine et universali Christi satisfactione, contra Photinianos, Papistas et Calvinianos : præside J. S. 4to. *Witteb.*

——— Les sentimens de St. Augustin et de toute l'Eglise touchant les propositions que la faculté de Theologie de Paris a fait examiner depuis quelque temps. 4to. *Paris.*
Another ed., 1709, 4to.

——— **Harris** (Robert, *D.D.*) A Discourse of Man's Estate in the first and second Adam. 8vo. *Lond.*
A puritan divine, held the living of Hanwell, Oxfordshire, and was President of Trinity Coll., Oxford, 1648—1658. See his life by Durham, 1660, 12mo.

——— **Maresius** (Sam.) Synopsis Doctrinæ de Gratia. 4to. *Groning.*

——— **Zuingerus** (M. Johannes) Disputatio Theologica de Peccato originali. 4to. *Genev.*

——— Acta et decreta Almæ Universitatis Pictaviensis super receptione et observatione bullæ Innocentii Papæ X contra quinque propositiones hæreticas Jansenistarum. 8vo. *Pictavii.*

——— **Arnauld** (Ant.) Esclaircissement sur quelques nouvelles objections touchant les cinq propositions attribuées à M. l'Evêque d'Ipre. 4to.

——— **Marche** (Lud. de) Apologia pro veritate constitutionis Innocentii Papæ X. qua declarantur et definiuntur quinque propositiones in materia fidei. 8vo. *Leodii.*

——— **Macedo** (Franc. à S. Aug.) Lituus Lusitanus ; buccinæ Anglicanæ Thomæ Angli canenti occinens. 4to. *Lond.*
Not in the Brit. Mus. Printed by N. Norton.

——— **Arnauld** (Ant.) Memoire sur le dessein qu' ont les Jesuites de faire retomber la censure des cinq propositions sur la véritable doctrine de Saint Augustin ; sous le nom de Jansenius. 4to.

——— **Macedo** (Franc. à Aug.) Scrinium D. Augustini, in quo arcana illius de adjutorio *sine quo non* sensa continentur; addita libra cum æquamento Augustini inter Calvinianos et Arminianos. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Drejerus** (Christ.) Vindicatio Sanctitatis Dei, ne per Abusum vocabulorum causa peccati statuatur. *Regiom.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

1654. **Walckenierius** (Joan.) Quæstiones philologico-theologicæ, ad illustrationem loci Matthæi cap. ii., vers. i., de memorabili vocatione Magorum ad Christi cognitionem et cultum; in quibus varii errores Pontificiorum de cultu Sanctorum, et Remonstrantium de gratia Dei, libero arbitrio et vocationis modo refutantur. 8vo. *Harderv.*
Not in the Brit Mus.

——— **Maresius** (Sam.) Apologia novissima pro sancto Augustino, Jansenio et Jansenistis, contra Pontificem et Jesuitas. 4to. *Groningæ.*

——— **Latermannus** (John) Veritas modesta et Pacifica Vorsehung der lehre der Evangelischen von der *Prædistination.* 4to. *Fr.*

——— **Haggar** (Henry) The Order of Causes, of God's Foreknowledge, &c. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Homes** or **Holmes** (Nathaniel, D.D.) The Resurrection Revealed. fol. *Lond.*
5. About the liberty of man's will from necessitation, to open and clear the manner of Adam's fall.
The Author was a Fifth-Monarchy divine, ejected from the living of St. Mary's Staining, London, for Nonconformity in 1662.
The above work has a commendatory Preface by Peter Sterry.
In 1661 Holmes published a vindication of the above work, and a new ed. was edited by Rev. J. W. Brooks in 1833, 8vo, see Athen.-Oxon.
The above work is able, sound, and valuable, much more so than might be expected from the author's leading sentiments.

——— **Bernaldo de Quiros** (Antonio) Selectæ disputationes theologicæ de Deo, fol. *Lugd.*
Containing De Essentia et Attributis. De Visione. De Scientia. De Voluntate Dei.
Rare.

——— **Hildebrandus** (Joach.) De Attributis Divinis. 4to. *Helmst.*

[1654.] **Arnoldus** (Nic.) De Cognitione Dei naturali. 4to. *Amstel.*

1654. **Egardus** (Paul.) Wahre Weitzheit zur Seligleit oder woher Erländnitz Gottes und des Menschen. 12mo. *Hamb.*
Also author of "Gnadenwahl Jesu Christi," *Hamb.*, 8vo.

——— **Bagot** (Joan.) Apologeticus Fidei duas in Partes tributus; cujus II. Partis, Lib. V., cap. V., Doctrinam Jansenii de libertate, &c. fol. *Paris.*

1655. **Henas** (Gabr. de) De Scientia Media Historicè propugnata. *Lugd.*
Another ed., *Salmant.*, 1665, fol.
The Author was a Jesuit.

——— **Cloppenburgius** (Joh.) Exercitationes Theologiæ. 4to. *Francof.*
(Arminian.)

——— **Gerhardus** (Joh.) Disp. Acad. de gloria Dei. 4to. *Jenæ.*
(Predestination.)

1655. **Bramhall** (John, *D.D.*) A Defence of True Liberty in answer to Hobbes. pp. 253, 8vo. *Lond.*
The author was Archbp. of Armagh.
In his contention with Hobbes he argued with great acuteness.

——— **Calixtus** (Geo.) De Peccato Originali, Prædestinatione, &c. 4to. *Wolferb.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.
Another ed., *Helmst.*, 1659, 8vo, under Title, "Tractatus diversi de Peccato."

——— **Hobson** (Paul) A Discourse about the extent of Christ's death, and the nature and truth of Election. *Lond.*

——— **Cellotius** (Lud.) Historia Gotteschalci Prædestinatiani. fol. *Paris.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.
"Qua contra Manguinum disputat hæresinque prædestinatianam omnino exstitisse, adfirmat ad se Sirmondi defensorem præbet."—*Walch.*
"Ouvrage estimé."—*Feller.*
The author was a Jesuit, who died 1658. Date in Lipenius, 1654, vol. 2, p. 57, and 1665, vol 2, p. 525.

——— **Bœhme** (Jacob) Concerning the Election of Grace; or, of God's will towards man, commonly called Prædestination. Written in German by J. Bœhme [Translated by John Sparrow.] 4to. *Lond.*
The author was a Mystic.

——— **Vorstius** (Joannes) De divinæ gratiæ in hominibus.....efficacia et operandi modo, *Pœs.* C. Mauritio. 4to. *Rostochii.*
Also a Dissertation on same subject, *Amstel.*, see Lipenius Bibl. Real. Theol. i., 743.

——— **Lewthwat** (R.) Vindiciæ Christi et obex errori Arminiano: a plea for Christ, etc. 4to.

——— **Ribadeneira** (Gasp. de) Tractatus de Voluntate Dei. 4to. *Alcalæ.*

——— **Verruhert** (Wess.) Disputatio de Fœdere Dei. 4to. *Lug. Bat.*

——— **Vogelius** (Hen.) Disputatio de Fœdere Dei. 4to. *Lug. Bat.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Artopæus** (Rudolph. Theod.) Disputatio de Fœdere Dei. 4to. *Lug. Bat.*

——— **Hartenbergius** (Joan.) Disputatio de Fœdere Dei. 4to. *Lug. Bat.*

——— **Launoy** (Benj. de) Disputatio de Fœdere Dei. 4to. *Lug. Bat.*

——— **Taylor** (Jer., D.D.) Unum Necessarium; or, the Doctrine and Practice of Repentance. 8vo. *Lond.*
4th ed., 1710, 8vo.
This distinguished divine was Fell. of All Souls, 1636, and chaplain to Archbishop Laud; Rector of Uppingham in 1638; Bishop of Down and Connor, 1660—1, and of Dromore, 1661. He died 1667.
The above work led the writer into the consideration of original sin; he adopted the views of the Calvinists but carried them to such an extreme that his doctrine was generally attacked. Dr. Warner led the assault in a letter, July 28, 1656, and Dr. Saunderson, afterwards Bp. of Lin-

coln, followed. Jeremy Taylor, replied in two Tracts, one—"Deus Justificatus," 1656, the other "A further explication of the Doctrine of original sin."

Taylor's Polemical Discourses were published together, *Lond.*, 1674, fol.

Jer. Taylor in his Liberty of Prophecy treats also of original sin.

1655. **Dallæus** (Joan.) Apologia pro duabus Ecclesiarum in Gallia Protestantium synodis nationalibus.. ..adversus F. Spanhemii exercitationes de gratia universali. 2 vols, 8vo. *Amst.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

Another ed., *Amst.*, 1657, 2 vols., 8vo.

——— **Hulsemannus** (Joh.) De Auxiliis gratiæ contra Pontificios Calvinianos et cum primis Arminianos. 4to. *Lips.*

Other eds., *Lips.*, 1677, 4to; *Francof.*, 1705, 4to; *Lips.*, 1706.

——— ——— Disputatio Theologica de Peccato in genere et in specie de Peccato originali. 4to. *Lips.*

——— **La Place** (Josué de) De Imputatione primi peccati Adami. 4to. *Salm.*

"Damnata est in synodo Charentoniensi."—*Walch.*

Another ed., *Ebend. et Salm.*, 1661, 4to.

——— **Schmidius** (David) De Agentibus liberis dissertatio Philosophica. *Jenæ.*

——— **Twisse** (Wm.) Answer to a Booke intituled *God's love to mankinde manifested by disproving his absolute Decree for their damnation;* with a vindication of Twisse againit Goodwin. *Oxon.*

——— **Schmidt** (Seb.) Disp. de Phrasi S. Scripturæ quâ Deus dicitur indurare excœcare, &c. 4to. *Arg.*

The author was Prof. of Theology at Strasburg, and wrote "Disputatio Theologica de certitudine perseverantiæ et salutis," &c., 4to.

——— **Calovius** (Abr.) Systema locorum Theologicorum, e Sacra potiss. Scriptura et Antiquitate. 12 vols. *Vitemb.*

Vol. v., art. 1, cap. 2, vol 2, cap. X. (Cause of Sin and Grace.)

Vol. x., art., ix. (Elect. and Pred.), art. x. (Reprob.)

The author was a celebrated Lutheran divine, distinguished for his opposition to the Socinians.

——— ——— Consideratio Arminianismi. 4to. *Vitemb.*

Other eds., *same place*, 1657 and 1671, 4to.

——— **Micrælius** (Jac.) *Resp.* de Peccato Originali. 4to. *Witteb.*

——— **Gerhardus** (Joh. Ern.) Disputatio Theologica de Universalitate Gratiæ Dei, &c., Marco Frid. Wendelino opposita. 4to. *Jenæ.*

——— Mens divinitus inspirata Innocentii X super quinque propositiones Jansenii et mens Augustini illustrata de duplici adjutorio gratiæ, sine quo non et quo. 4to.

1655. **Bubbenius** (Tho.) Disputatio de Fœdere Dei. 4to. *Lugd. Bat.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Burches** (George) The doctrine of Original Sin maintained on Psalm li., 5. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— Des Ministerii zu Königsberg Erörterung der Frage von der Erbsünde wider D. Drenern. 4to. *Königsb.*

——— **Blake** (Tho.) The covenant sealed. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Colvill** (Will.) Refreshing streams flowing from the fulness of Christ, in several sermons. 4to. *Lond.*

Effectual Calling and Perseverance in Grace.

——— **Suarez** (Franc.) Tractatus Theologicus de vera intelligentia Auxilii efficacis, ejusque concordia cum libero arbitrio. fol. *Lugd.*

This ed. not in Brit. Mus.

In the 9th vol of the collected works of the Author, *Venet.*, 1740–51, fol., 23 vols.

——— **Guyard** (Bern.) Discrimina inter doctrinam Thomisticam et Jansenianam. 4to. *Par.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Preville** (Sieur de) [le P. Pinthereau, Jesuit] Le progrès du Jansenisme découvert. 4to. *Avignon.*

In this work is contained the whole proceedings against San-Cyran.

——— **Truchses** (Eusebius) Quæstiones de Gratia. 12mo, pp. 190. *Romæ.*

The author was a Jesuit, see De Bacher, iv., 703.

——— **Meisnerus** (Jo.) De universali omnium et singulorum hominum ad ecclesiam et æternam salutem vocatione. 4to. *Vitemb.*

He was also author of a treatise on the Merits of Christ, *Witteb.*, 1677, 4to.

——— **Spanheim** (Frid.) Disputatio de quinquarticulanis controversiis pridem in Belgio agitatis, &c. *Lug. Bat.*

See too 1687; also treated in General Controversies, *Leidæ*, 1677, 12mo.

——— **Canterus** (Corn.) Disputatio de Fœdere Dei. 4to. *Lugd. Bat.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

1656. **[Pean]** Le Combat du Molinisme contre le Jansénisme. 2 vols, 12mo. *Amst.*

"Le dessein de l'auteur est de donner une connoissance claire et distincte des erreurs des Jésuites sur toutes les matières de la grace."—*Pref.*

——— **Calovius** (Abr.) Discussio controversiæ de universali vocationis gratia. 4to. *Vitemb.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Maresius** (Sam.) Epicrisis theologica ad quæstiones de gratia et redemptione universali. 12mo. *Groning.*

Another ed., *same place*, 1658, 12mo, with additions against Dallæus's work of the previous year; another ed., *same place*, 1661, 4to.

Maresius also wrote "Epistola ad Amicum de V. Part. Voetii," *Groning.*, 1669, 4to; "Theologus Paradoxus contra Voetium," *ib.*, 1653; and "Defensio Fidei Catholicæ contra Curcellæum," *ib.*, 1662.

About this time, without date, Pinghonus published his work at *Oxon*, "De Universali Redemptione."

1656. **Coccejius** (Joh.) Collationes de Fœdere et Testamento Dei. 8vo. *Lugd. Bat.*

The same year and place appeared an ed. of his "Summa Doctrinæ de Fœdere et Testamento Dei." The 1st ed. was 1648, subsequent ones, *Lug. Bat.*, 1654, 12mo; *Amst.*, 1672, 8vo. It appeared, *Middelb.*, 1677, 4to, see 1648.

——— **Larkham**.—Sermons on the Attributes of God. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Zoega** (Jo.) Disp. Inauguralis de Purgatorio et Causa Peccati. 4to. *Rost.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Barlee** (Will.) Predestination defended against Post-Destination. sm. 4to.

Very rare—never met but one copy out of the Brit. Mus.

Barlee was of Brock-hole, Northampton.

——— **Reynolds** (Edw., *D.D.*) Epistolary Preface toWilliam Barlee's,correptory corrections, &c., of some notes of Thomas Pierce concerning God's Decrees, especially of Reprobation. 4to. *Lond.*

Reynolds was Bp. of Norwich, and died 1676.

——— [**Pascal** (Blaise)] XVIII Lettres écrites d'un Provincial par un de ses amis, sur le sujet des Disputes présentés de la Sorbonne. 4to.

The original edition is rare. Sold in the Earl of Crawford's sale for £22.

Other ed., [*Amst.*], 1669, 12mo; 1712, 3 tom., in four languages, *Cologne*, 1684, 8vo.

These celebrated letters have been translated into English; 1st ed., 1657, 12mo; 2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1658, pp. xi. 359, 8vo; 1664, 8vo; *Paris*, 1815, 2 vols, 12mo; 1848, 8vo; 1865, 8vo; *Weymouth*, 1816, pp. 383, 8vo; *New York*, 1828, 8vo; with Introd. Notes by Thos. M'Crie, *D.D.*, 1851, fcp. 8vo; in Works, 1849—50, 3 vols, 8vo.

See Walch. Bibl. Theol., ii., 294—6. In French *Lyon*, 1687, 12mo; *Cologne*, 1739, 4 vols, 12mo.

——— [**Arnauld**, Nicole, et de la Lane] Vindiciæ S. Thomæ circa gratiam sufficientem, adversus Fratrem Joannen Nicolai. 4to.

——— **Claubergius** (Joh.) Exercitationes C. de Cognitione Dei et nostri. 8vo. *Duisb.*

Another ed., *same place*, 1665, 8vo.

——— **Placœus** (Jos.) Opuscula, Dissert. De libero hominis arbitrio. 4to. *Salm.*

——— **Baker** (Thomas) God's Providence asserted. A Serm. 12mo. *Lond.*

The author was Rector of St. Mary the More, Exeter.

——— **Molinus** (Lud.) Parænesis ad Ædificatores imperii in imperio contra Mos. Amyraldum et Joh. Dallæum. 4to. *Lond.*

(*Arminian*).

1656. **Gerhardus** (Jo. Ernest.) Synopsis Arminianismi; sive Sententia Remonstrantium circa aliquot fidei Christianæ Articulos. 4to. *Jenæ.*

——— **Olonergan** (Phil.) Epistola apologetica ad Stephanum le Camus, regium Eleemosynarium. 8vo. *Paris.*

[1656.] **Lalemadet** (Joh.) De Dei natura ejusque attributis. 4to.

1656. [**Arnauld** (Ant.)]Dissert. theol. de propositione Augustiana circa gratiam sufficientem.

Also the same year Arnauld issued "Trois lettres apologetiques," see Walch Bibl. Theol. ii., 944.

——— ——— Diss. Theol. in qua confirmatur propositio Augustiniana: Defint. Petro gratia, sine qua nihil possumus. 4to.

Another ed., *Colon.*, 1704, 8vo.

——— Historia Gotteschalci prædestinati. *Paris.*

——— Philippus a S. Trinitate, Disputationes Theologicæ. 4to. *Coloniæ.*

Vol 2, De Gratia.

——— **Borrull** (Matthias) Divina Scientia futurorum contingentium, præcipue Media, contra novissimos impugnatores defensa. pp. 274, 4to. *Lugd.*

Another ed., *Lugd.*, 1663, 4to.

No ed. in Brit. Mus.

This was written by a Jesuit, and against a work entitled "De Primatu divinæ libertatis ad sciendum et discernendum de contingentibus, contra Scientiam Mediam Authore Hieronymo Vives Valentino," *Valentiæ*, 1654. Borrull also wrote a Tract "De essentia et attributis et de visione Dei," *Lugd.*, 1664, 4to.

——— **Bramhall** (John, *Archbp. of Armagh*) Bramhall and Hobbes's Discourses on Liberty and Necessity. sm. 4to. *Lond.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

Bramhall's discourse is in vol 4 of collected works, *Oxf.*, 1844, 5 vols, 8vo.

He was one of the most learned, able and active prelates of his age. The above, and work mentioned 1658, by him, are particularly valuable.

——— **Warner** (John) A Letter to Dr. Taylor concerning the chapter of Original Sin in his *Unum Necessarium*. 12mo. *Lond.*

Another ed., 1712, 8vo.

Warner was Bp. of Rochester, 1637, died 1666. He was an accurate logician, philosopher and scholastic divine, see David Lloyd's Memoirs, *Lond.*, 1668, fol., p. 602.

——— **Taylor** (Jeremy, *D.D.*) A Further explication of the Doctrine of Original Sin, &c. 8vo. *Lond.*

See too his collected works, 3rd ed., *Lond.*, 1839, 15 vols, 8vo. Vols 8 and 9, wherein the author's "Deus Justificatus" is contained; also

vol 14, book 4, which is on the Nature and Cause of good and evil.

The tract on Original Sin is reprinted in vol 2 of the Tracts of the Anglican Fathers, p. 267.

1656. **Judiculus** locorum Augustini C. Jansenii in quibus propositiones ab Inn. X. damnatæ continentur. 4to.

——— **Glumbergius** De cognitione Dei et Nostri. 8vo. *Lugd.*

So in Lipenius, i. 507, but probably a mistake for Claubergius (John) which see.

——— **Taylor** (Jeremy, *D.D.*) Two Answers to the Bp. of Rochester's [Warner] two letters concerning the Chapter of original sin in the *Unum Necessarium.* 12mo. *Lond.*

——— ——— Deus Justificatus: a Vindication of the Divine Attributes in the question of original sin.

This was a defence of the peculiar views advanced in the *Unum Necessarium* (1655, 8vo), against the remonstrances called forth by that work from Bp. Warner and others.

1656—60. **Jeanes** (Hen.) Mixture of Scholastical Divinity with Practicall. 2 vols. sm. 4to.

The book contains several letters of Jeanes to Jeremy Taylor concerning original sin, see 1660. The author was Rector of Beercrocombe, Capland and Chedzoy, Somersetshire. He is styled "honest Jeanes," by Cotton Mather.

1656. **Campanella** (T.) Calvinismus Triumphatus, &c., et de Auxiliis Gratiæ Divinæ. 4to. *Paris.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Woodbridge** (Benj.) The Method of Grace in the Justification of sinners. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Warren** (Ed.) Caleb's inheritance in Canaan, by grace not works. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **[Bianchi** (And.)] De Præscientia Dei ac Prædestinatione, Disputatio Candidi Philaleti. 8vo. *Gen.*

Not apparently in B. M.

The author was a Jesuit, who d. 1657.

——— **Lamb** (Thos.) Absolute freedom from sin by Christ's death. 4to. *Lond.*

Another ed., 1709. The author was a Puritan Calvinist, and the book is against John Goodwin. "It is evident [from the above work] how grossly both Edwards [in his Gangræna] and Baillie [in his Anabaptism] have misrepresented the fact, in stating that Mr. Lamb maintained and taught either the Arminian or Antinomian tenets. On the contrary, it is extremely obvious that upon the disputed points, he was a strict Calvinist."—*Brooks.*

——— **Arnauld** (Ant.) Vera S. Thomæ de gratia sufficiente et efficaci doctrina. 4to.

1657. **Chemnitius** (Christ.) Disp. inauguralis de Problemate: an Lutherani et Calviniani in fundamentalibus Fidei articulis consentiant? In qua pro negante Parte potissmum expenditur Locus de Prædestinatione. 4to. *Jenæ.*

Not in Brit. Mus.

Also author of "De Arbore Scientiæ Boni et Mali," *Jenæ*, 1659, 4to; and "Disp. IV. de Arbore Vitæ," *Jenæ*, 1657, 4to.

1657. **Strangius** (Joannes, *D.D.*) De voluntate et actionibus Dei circa peccatum. pp. 886. 4to. *Elzev., Amst.*

Another ed., *Amst.*, 1663, 4to. The author was Princip. of the Univer. of Glasgow, 1626, and d. 1654. The dedication, preface, and poems prefixed were written by the celebrated Alexander Morus. The work is of a metaphysical nature.

——— **Pierce** (Thos.) The Divine Purity defended. 4to. *Lond.*

This is a reply to Dr. Reynolds's Epistolary preface to Barlee's Correptory Correction.

——— ——— Divine Philanthropie defended. 4to. *Lond.*

Another ed., 1658, 4to.

——— **Kendall** (Geo.) Fur pro Tribunali, seu Examen Dialogismi cui inscribitur *Fur prædestinatus.* 8vo. *Oxon.*

In this volume is also contained—Oratio de Doctrina Neo-Pelagiana habita Oxonii in comitiis Julii ix, 1654; Twissii Vita et Vindiciæ à Calumniis F. Annati—Dissertatio de novis actibus immanentibus Sintne Deo abscribendi.

——— **Usher** (Jas.) Judgment on the extent of Christ's death. 12mo.

——— **Conyers** (Tobias) The just man's defence. pp. 156. 12mo. *Lond.*

The declaration of the judgment of Arminius on the principal points of religion, translated by T. Conyers.

——— **Gery** (Thos.) The fortroyal of Christianity defended; with a discussion of some of the great controversies in religion about universal redemption, freewill, original sin, &c. 12mo. *Lond.*

——— **Roberts** (Franc.) The Covenant of God with man in Adam before the fall, and in Christ after the fall. fol. *Lond.*

The author was a learned Puritan—Rector of Wrington, Somersetshire, 1649, d. 1675.

——— **Swanevelt** (Joannes à) *Resp.* Disputatio Philosophica de libero Hominis Arbitrio, *Præs.* J. de Bruyn. 4to. *Trajecti ad Rhenum.*

——— **Love** (Christ.) Grace and the degrees thereof. 4to.

Republished 1810. 12mo. "Thou wilt find here no new, uncouth, and unscriptural expressions, but plain, practical doctrine, old divinity, sound, solid, and conscience-searching truths."—*Ed. Calamy.*

"A plain, impressive, evangelical, and holy writer."—*Bickersteth.*

——— **Pean** (Sieur) Traité des Controverses, contenant la solution des objections des Luthériens, Calvinistes, et Jansénistes. 4to. *Paris.*

——— Bulle de N. S. Pere le Pape Alexandre VIII. par laquelle sa Saintelé confirme la Bulle d'Innocent X. son Predecesseur, touchant les cinq Propositions. 4to. *Paris.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

1657. **Massonus** (P.) De Certitudine salutis. 4to. *Salmurii.*

——— **Bourg** (Moyse du) Le Jansénisme foudroié par la Bulle d'Innocent X. 8vo. *Bourdeaux.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.
A Jesuit, who died at Limoges in 1662.

——— **Brookes** (Matt.) The Sacred and most mysterious history of man's redemption. fol. *Lond.*

——— **Strong** (William) A Treatise on the Subordination of Man's Will to the Will of God. pp. 335. 8vo. *London.*

——— **Becanus** (Mart.) Summa Theolog. scholasticæ duobus tractatibus auctæ, uno de natura Theologiæ, altero de Gratiæ auxiliis, per Gervas. Bigeonium.

A previous ed. of the Summa had appeared, *Paris*, 1615.

——— **Juvernay** (P.) Théologie positive touchant la grace et le libre arbitre. 12mo. *Par.*

——— Elenchus Apologeticus ad Maresii Sententiam de Prædestinatione. 8vo. *Ultrajecti.*

(Calvinistic.)

——— **Bidwell** (Robt.) Covenant of Grace. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Whitfield** (Thos.) Vindication of God's Absolute Decree, &c. 4to.

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Arnauld** (Ant.) De Gratia. 4to. *Paris.*

——— **Baxter** (Richard) Present Thoughts concerning the Controversy about the Perseverancy of the Saints. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Calovius** (Abr.) De gratiæ Dei universalitate ad salutem. 4to. *Witteb.*

——— ——— De Gratia conversionis irresistibili et defectibili. 4to. *Witteb.*

Neither of the last two works in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Scharfius** (Jo.) De fide catholica de gratia vocationis. 4to. *Witteb.*

——— **Nicole** (Pet.) Tredecim Theologorum ad examinandas quinque propositiones ab Innocentio X selectorum suffragia. 4to.

——— **Irenæus** (Paul.) Disquisitiones ad præsentes Ecclesiæ tumultus sedandos opportunæ. 4to.

——— **Croullardiere** (Franc. Peau de la) Conférence d'un catholique avec un Janseniste. 2nd ed. 4to. *Par.*

1657. **Titius** (Ger.) De viribus humanis, sive libero hominis post lapsum arbitrio, conversione, perseverantia ejusque certitudine, dissertatio theologica. 4to. *Helmst.*

Another ed., same place, 1670.

——— **Syricius** (Mich.) Exercit. Acad. de gravissima Controversia; an Intuitus fidei finalis ordine præcedat, an vero Ordine sequatur Election. ætern. 4to. *Giessæ.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Foullon** (Stardus) Bona Voluntas, optimè consentiens, seu de Nutu Providentiæ Divinæ in omnibus amplectendo. 12mo. *Leod.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Dorschæus** (John Geo.) Dissertationes novissimæ, quorum prior est de Gratia Epicrisis ad Ferrium, &c. 4to. *Rost.*

Another ed., 1661.

——— **Wallis** (Jo.) Mens Sobria serio commendata: acced. Expositio Epist. ad Titum. Theses Theol. an Electio Divina dependeat ex prævisione liberi actus creaturæ! Neg., &c. 18mo. *Oxon.*

1658. **Hülsemannus** (Jo.) Disputatio de prædestinatione. *Lips.*

——— **Calovius** (Abr.) Vindiciæ considerationis Arminianismi oppositæ exercitationi apologeticæ Herici Nicolai. 4to. *Witteb.*

See Walch Bibl. Theol., ii, 552.

——— **Quiros** (Ant. Bern. de) Selectæ disputationes de Prædestinatione, &c. fol. *Lugd.*

The author was a Jesuit, Rector of the Coll. at Vallodolid, where for 19 years he lectured on dogmatic theology. He d. 1668.

——— **Barlee** (Will.) A Necessary vindication of the doctrine of Predestination formerly asserted. pp. 149. 4to. *Lond.*

Very rare.
Not in the Brit. Mus.
The work contains "a full abstersion of all calumnies cast upon the 'late correptory correction' by one who highly pretends to Philanthropie whilest he doth most inhumanely and barbarously traduce his neighbour, as also most Reformed Authours."

——— **Goodwin** (John) Triumviri, or the genius, spirit and deportment of 3 men, Mr. Rich. Resbury, Mr. John Pawson, and Mr. Geo. Kendall, in their late writings against the free grace of God. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Wilkinson** (Hen., *D.D.*) Conciones VI., cum 2 Tractatibus de Jure Divino Diei Dominicæ, et de Impotentia

liberi Arbitrii ad bonum spirituale.
pp. 200, 210. 8vo. *Lond.*

In the author's Three decades of sermons lately preached to the Univ. of St. Mary's Ch. in Oxford, 1660, *Oxf.*, 4to, 3rd decad., p. 52, will be found a Serm. on "God's providence common and speciall set forth." Wilkinson was Prin. of Magdalen Hall, Oxford.

1658. **Womoch** (Dr. Laur.) The Examination of Tilenus before the Tryers. 8vo. *Lond.*

This ed. not in the B. M.
In Nichol's Calvinism and Arminianism, 1824.

——— **Ward** (Sam.) Determinationes Theologicæ, Tract. de Justificatione, et Prælect. de Peccato originali, edita a S. W. fol. *Lond.*

——— **Spanhemius** (Frid.) Disputatio inauguralis de quinque articulis controversis, confutata ab A. Pœlenburgh. 8vo. *Amst.*

——— **Freysleben** (N.) De Peccato Originis. 4to. *Jenæ.*

——— **Poelenburgh** (Arn.) Confutatio disputationis Fred. Spanhemii de Prædestinatione, &c. 8vo. *Lond.*

An ed. same year, *Amst.*, 8vo. Poelenburgh was also author of a letter under the letters A. F. B. ad C. H., that is Christ. Hartsæker, on the controversies with Hoornbeck, *Amst.*, 1655, 8vo.

——— ——— Dissertatio de Remonstrantibus. 8vo. *Amst.*

——— **Pierce** (Thos.) Αὐτοκατάκρισις or Self condemned.....with occasional reflections on Mr. Calvin, etc. 4to. *Lond.*

——— Ἑαυτοντιμωρούμενος, or The Self Revenger exemplified in Mr. William Barlee. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Pierce** (Thos.) The Christian's Rescue from the grand error of the Heathen (touching the fatal necessity of all events) and the dismal consequences thereof, which have slily crept into the Church, in several defences of some notes writ to vindicate the primitive and scriptural doctrine of God's decree. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Rawson** (Jas.) On Election and Reprobation. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Deutschmannus** (Jo.) Resp. Joach. Erytheræo, de Prædestinatione. 4to. *Witteb.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.
Also author of "De attributis Divinis," *Witteb.*, 4to; and "De Cognitione Dei Naturali," *Witteb.*, 1679, 4to.

——— **Strauchius** (Ægid.) Dissertatio de Prædestinatione. *Vitemb.*

Not in Brit. Brit.
Also Author of "*Resp.* de Merito Christi," *Witteb.*, 1652, 4to.

———Bulle d'Alexandre VII., du 16 Oct. 1658, qui confirme celle d'Innocent X., touchant les cinq propositions de Jansenius; avec la declaration du Roy du 19 Decembre, 1657. 4to. *Paris.*

1658. **Votier** (J.) Vox Dei et hominis. God's call from heaven echoed by man's answer from earth, or a survey of Effectual calling.
pp. 320 and contents. 12mo. *Lond.*

Very rare. Never met but one other copy except own, and that is in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Bramhall** (John) Castigations of Mr. Hobbes, his last animadversions, in the case concerning liberty and universal Necessity. pp. 573. 8vo. *Lond.*

In this work Bramhall undertakes to prove, out of Hobbes's own writings, that no sincere Hobbist can be a good Christian or a good commonwealths man, or reconcile himself to himself. There seems to have been an ed. in 1657, 8vo.

——— **Hammon** (Geo.) Syon's Redemption and original sin vindicated. 4to. *London.*

Another ed. *Lond.*, 1685, 4to.

——— **N. N.** The examination of Tilenus before the Triers in order to his intended settlement in Utopia, etc. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Heylyn** (Peter, *D.D.*) Discovery and Removal of the Stumbling block of disobedience and rebellion cunningly laid down in the subject's way by Calvin. 4to. *Lond.*

The author was a Fell. of Magdalen Coll., Oxf.; Rector of Hemmingford, Hunts., and Preb. of Westminster. He was later Rector of Houghton, of which living he was deprived during the Rebellion. He was an able critic in the Arminian interest, but his statements are not to be relied on. He d. 1662.

——— **Sedgwick** (Obadiah) The Shepherd of Israel, together with the doctrine of Providence practically handled. sm. 4to. *Lond.*

A German transl., Colnan der Spree 1671, 8vo.
The author was a Calvinist, and a member of the Westminster Assembly of Divines.

——— The Mystery of Jesuitisme, discovered in letters between the Jansenists and Molinists. 12mo. *Lond.*

——— **Solon** (Pet. Fitan) Disp. de Vindiciis Gratiæ Christi. 8vo. *Francof.*

Very rare.

——— **Bisco** (John) The grand triall of true Conversion: or Sanctifying Grace appearing and acting first and chiefly in the Thoughts. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Sibbs** (Rich., *D.D.*) The Saints Cordials. fol. *Lond.*

P. 341. The Saint's assurance (2 Serm.) In his collected Works, *Aberd.*, 1812, 3 vols, 8vo, vol. 3, p. 371, will be found a sermon entitled, "St. Paul's Challenge, on Rom. viii. 30." "A very tender and striking writer, well adapted for consolation."—*Bickersteth.*

Sibbs was Preacher of Gray's Inn, 1618, and Master of Catherine's Hall, Camb., 1625.
He d. 1635.

1658. **Bourg** (Moise du) L'histoire du Jansénisme. pp. 149. 16mo. *Bord.*
Not in the B. M.
Rare and valuable, containing the constitution of Alex. VII, and confirmation of that of Innocent X against the five propositions of Jansen.

——— **Gassendi** (Pet.) Opera omnia. 6 vols. *Lugd.*
Vol. 2, lib. iii, De libertate, fortuna, fato et divinatione.
The author was the eminent philosopher and mathematician. He was D.D. and Canon in the Cathedral of Digne in Provence, being later Regius Prof. of Mathematics at Paris.
He d. 1655.

——— **Molinus** (Pet.) Epistola Adamicum in qua Gratiam divinam, seque defendit, adv. Dallæum. 12mo. *Lond.*
Also joint author with Mos. Amyraut of "Apologia pro Dei Misericordia, Sapientia, et justitia." *Rotob.*, 1655, 8vo.

——— **Stephens** (Nath.) Threefold defence of the doctrine of Original Sin. 4to. *Lond.*
Against the doctrine as held by Jeremy Taylor.

——— **Jammy** (Pet.) Veritates de auxilio gratiæ ab erroribus et falsis opinionibus vindicatæ, quas defendunt theologiæ grationopolitanæ candidati, Augustinianis et Thomisticis armis instructi. 12mo. *Gration.*

——— **Gerhardus** (Jo. Ernest) Disputatio Theologica de Strigelianismo. 4to. *Jenæ.*

——— ——— Disputatio de Flacianismo. *Jenæ.*

1659. **Bunyan** (John) The doctrine of Law and Grace unfolded. 8vo. *Lond.*
Other ed., *Lond.*, 1685, 8vo; 1708, 12mo; 1736, 12mo; 1760, 12mo; 1762, 12mo; 1781, 12mo; 1788, 8vo; 1802, 12mo; 1805, pp. 305, 12mo. In Welsh, *Caerfyrddin*, 1767, 12mo; *Trefecca*, 1781, 12mo.

——— **Cameron** (Jo.) Miscellanea. fol. *Genev.*
Edited by Frid. Spanheim.
Not in Brit. Mus.

——— **Pierce** (Thos.) The New Discoverer discovered by way of answer to Mr. Baxter in his pretended discovery of the Grotian Religion. pp. 309. 4to. *Lond.*
Written against Baxter and Hickman, he proves the former by fourteen arguments to be a Papist.

——— **Heylyn** (Peter, *D.D.*) Certamen Epistolare; or the Letter combate managed by P. Heylyn with I. Mr. Baxter, &c. pp. 397. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **[Hickman** (H.)] Review of the Certamen Epistolare. By Theophilus Churchman. [Peter Heylyn.] 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **[Womoch** (Laur.)] Arcana dogmatum anti-Remonstrantium; or the Calvinist's Cabinet unlock'd. 12mo. *Lond.*
"Womoch's Arcana, in which he quotes expressions from the private writings of Calvinists, to support Tilenus's unfair abridgment of the Decrees of the Synod of Dort is a most unjustifiable mode of Defence."—*Bickersteth.* True, but the unfair abridgment of the Decrees is still worse. Yet this work was written with the express object of showing Richard Baxter that the abridgment of the Calvinistic Articles of the Synod which Bishop Womoch had inserted on the 39th page of *The Examination of Tilenus*, was virtually correct.

1659. **Felix** (Franc.) Tract. de Scientia Dei; de Voluntate Dei, de prædestinatione ac reprobatione. 2nd Ed. 4to. *Conpluti.*

——— **Rutherford** (Sam.) Life of Grace. 4to.

——— **Euchhasen** (Jo.) Divina rerum scientia futurorumque contingentium præscientia. *Helmst.*

——— **Brinsley** (John) Gospel Marrow. 8vo. *Lond.*
(Redemption.)

——— **Hülsemannus** (Joh.) Disputatio Theologica de Pacto Dei, cum toto humano genere in protoplastis ante lapsum inito. 4to. *Lips.*

——— An Answer to the Provincial Letters. pp. 520, 12mo. *Paris.*
Contains a history of Jansenism written in the interests of the Jesuits. It is a thoroughly one-sided performance. Rather difficult to meet with. On p. 347 is an able "Answer to the Jansenist's complaint of being called heretiques," by Father Francis Annat.

——— **Bagshawe** (Edw.) Practical Discourse concerning God's Decrees. 4to. *Oxf.*

——— ——— A Letter to Mr. Thos. Pierce, containing amongst other things a brief state of the question about God's decrees, to which is annexed an Exercitation in Latin concerning Free-will. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Wales** (Elkanah) Mount Ebal levell'd; or, Redemption from the curse, on Gal., iii., 13. 8vo. *Lond.*
The author was a Puritan Minister of Pudsey, in Yorkshire, who died 1669.
A new ed. was pub. *Lond.*, 1823, 12mo; with life of author.

——— **Anglus** (Tho.) Sonus Buccinæ, seu de Virtutibus Fidei et Theologiæ et gratia, et libero Arbitrio, etc. 12mo. *Col.-Agrip.*
The 1st ed. of his Sonus Buccinæ was *Parisiis*, 1654, 12mo; but the ed. of 1659 first dealt with the special subjects of list in full.

——— **Schmidt** (Seb.) Tractatus de Imagine Dei in homine ante lapsum considerato.
pp. vi., 410 and Index, 4to. *Argent.*
Reprinted in 1702, 4to.
The ed. of 1659 is rare, see Walch, Bibl. Theol., i., 82—83

1660. **Curcellæus** (Steph.) Dissertationes adversus Maresium.
pp. 456, 8vo. *Amst.*
II., p. 270—356, de peccato originis.

——— **Clagett** (Nic.) The Abuse of God's Grace. 4to. *Oxf.*
The author was Vicar of Melbourne, Dorsetshire, about 1636, and subsequently Preacher at St. Mary's, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk.

——— **Usher** (Abp.) Eighteen Sermons preached in Oxford, 1640, on the Doctrine of...Redemption of Christ.
4to. *Lond.*
Grace.
Other eds. of his sermons, 1660, 4to; 1677, 1678, fol.; 1831, 1847, 1853, 8vo.
"Truly valuable, practical, and experimental."—*Bickersteth.*

——— God's absolute Election of a certaine and limited number unto Eternal life. *Oxford.*

——— **Aylesbury** (Tho.) Diatribæ de Divino Decreto. 4to. *Cantab.*
Lipenius has the date 1653, but this is a mistake.

——— **Chahu** (Philippe) Le secret de la prédestination, sur le petit nombre des ésleus, et sur la plus grande multitude des reprouvez, découvert, et compris en trois Traittez.
pp. 827, 4to. *Paris.*
The author was a Jesuit, Rector of the College of Tours, and died in 1679.

——— **Bossu** (Simon de) De l'usage de la Grâce. 4to, 3 vols. *Par.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.
The author was a Jesuit, who d. 1665.

——— **Wierzeysky** (Georges) Theses Theologicæ de Trinitate, peccatis, gratia. fol. *Bambergæ.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.
The author was a Jesuit, Prof. of philosophy and theology at the University of Bamberg.

———**Maccovius** Redivivus opera Nicolai Arnoldi. 4to. *Amst.*
Maccovius was also author of "Disp. de Providentia" and "Ostensio primi Falsi Arminianorum," *Francof.;* and "Prælectiones pro Perkinso contra Arminium," see Lipenius, Bibl. Real. Theol., i., 96.

——— **Walther** (Greg. Hern.) De Providentia. 4to. *Helmst.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Schotanus** (Mart.) Tractatus de Libero Arbitrio. 4to. *Groningæ.*

[1660.] **Bircherod** (James) Exercitationes contra Atheos de æterna Divinæ existentiæ et providentiæ veritate.
4to. *Hafnia.*
Very rare.
The author was Prof. of Theology at Copenhagen.

1660. **Binchius** (Joh.) Erklähiung des IX cap. an die Römer, Lapides offensionis, etc., genandt, etc. 4to. *Gies.*

——— **Jeanes** (Henry) Divers Letters of the same author, and Dr. Jeremy Taylor's about Original Sin.
fol. *Oxford.*

1660. **Cregutus** (Ant.) Biurim; hoc est, elucidationes de apicibus SS. theologiæ, sive theses de peccato originali et libero arbitrio, gratia et justificatione, etc. 4to. *Diæ.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Maresius** (Sam.) Apologia trimembris pro decisione synodi Dordracenæ, de objecto prædestinationis, opposita disputationi anti-synodicæ habitæ anno 1649. 4to. *Groningæ.*

——— **Wildius** (Joh. Dan.) Richitige Beweis, wie man den hohen Artickel von der Gnaden-Wahl recht versichern soll. 12mo. *Bas.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Hoornbeck** (Joh.) Disp. III. Practicæ de Prædestinatione.
4to. *Leidæ.*
The author was a Calvinist.

——— **Thomson** (Rich.) De Gratia.
4to. *Lug. Bat.*

——— **Howe** (John) A Serm. on Man's Creation in an holy, but mutable state.
See as to this writer, 1677.

——— **Brouwer** (Adrian) Disputatio de Prædestinatione. 4to. *Lug. Bat.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Coup** (Dan. de) Disputatio de Prædestinatione. 4to. *Lug. Bat.*
These last two works are very rare. Do not remember to have met with them anywhere save in Dr. Williams's library.
There is no copy in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Stockmans** (Jacob) Disputatio de Prædestinatione. 4to. *Lugd. Bat.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.
This is rare. Stockmans was also author of "Disputatio de Peccati pænis," *Lugd. Bat.*, 1661, 4to.

——— **Annesley** (Samuel, *LL.D.*) On the Covenant of Grace. A Sermon.
See 1844.
The author was an Eminent Nonconformist minister, nominated by Cromwell, Lecturer at St. Paul's, and in 1658 presented by Richard Cromwell to the Vicarage of St. Gile's, Cripplegate. He was ejected in 1662, d. 1696.

——— **Amelote** (Denys) La defense des Constitutions d'Innocent X. et Alexandre VII, etc., contre la doctrine de Jansenius. 4to. *Paris.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Ryssen** (Léon. à) De Prædestinatione dissertatio. 8vo. *Gorich.*
Another ed., same place, 1679, 8vo.
Neither in Brit. Mus.

——— **Hammond** (Hen., *D.D.*) A Pacifick discourse of God's Grace and Decrees. pp. 160. 8vo. *Lond.*
Written in the spirit of harmony, though in the interests of the Arminians, the author endeavouring to show that Bp. Sanderson accorded with him. Hammond was Rector of Penhurst in 1633, Archdeacon of Chichester in 1642, and named one of the Assembly of Divines, but never sat with them. In 1644 he was appointed a Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, and Public Orator, and named by Chas. I. as one of his Chaplains in ordinary. He

is best known for his Paraphrase and Annotations on the New Testament, *Lond.*, 1653, 1671, 1702, fol. He d. 1660.

1660. **Heylyn** (Pet., *D.D.*) Historia quinquarticularis, or a declaration of the judgment of the Western Church, more particularly the Ch. of England, in the five controversial points reproached in these last times by the name of Arminianism. 4to. *Lond.*

Another ed., *Lond.*, 1673, 8vo. In Dutch, trans. by Gerb. Brandt, *Roter.*, 1687, 8vo, see p. 107. The author was an Arminian, and a very inaccurate and unreliable historian.

——— **Pierce** (Thos.) An impartial inquiry into the Nature of Sin. sm. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Baxter** (Rich.) Parkerus illustratus; sive, Annotata quædam in omnes LXX. M. T. Parkeri theses, de traductione hominis peccatoris ad vitam. 8vo.

——— **Maresius** (Sam.) Sylloge Disputationum Theologicarum. 4to. *Groningæ.*

Part 2.

[1660.] **Amyraut** (Moses) La créance de M. A. sur les erreurs des Arminiens. 8vo.

The copy in the Brit. Mus. is without titlepage.

——— ——— De Serpente tentatore et peccato originis dissertatio. 12mo. *Salm.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

[1660.] **Curcellæus** (Step.) Vindiciæ de Jure Dei in creaturas.

The author takes the Baxterian view. He succeeded Episcopius in the Divinity Professorship at Amsterdam in 1643. Of the above work Bp. Womoch says, "It is of small price and of great profit." It was written in opposition to Amyraut's improvements on Cameronism. He combats with great ability Amyraut's doctrine of the necessity of Adam's sin. There is no copy in the Brit. Mus.

1660. **Sedgwick** (Obed.) The anatomy of Secret Sins, Presumptuous sins, sins in omissions & uprightness. 4to. *Lond.*

——— Syntagma Thesium Theologicarum in Acad. Salmur. disputatarum. 4to. *Salmur.*

A better ed., same place, 1664. The authors were Capellus, Amyraut, and Placæus.

——— Epistolæ Theologicæ et Ecclesiasticæ collectæ a Phil. à Limborch et Christ. Hartsæker. 8vo. *Amst.*

Reprinted *Amst.*, 1684, which see; and 1704, fol. This vol contains much relating to Arminianism, letters of Arminius, Uyttenbogardus, Vorstius, Vossius, Grotius, and others. "In illis est adparatus multæ eruditionis ac variarum rerum, quæ historiæ litterariæ atque ecclesiasticæ, præsertim de synodo Dordracena deque ipsis Arminianis eorumque controversiis, egregiam lucem adferunt ac multiplicem utilitatem præbent.' Walch, Bibl. Theol. ii, 545.

[1660.] **Annat** (Franc.) Rabat. joye des Jansenistes. 4to.

1661. Thesaurus Disput. Theol. in Sedanensi Academia variis temporibus habitarum. 2 vols. 4to. *Genev.*

The Professors were P. du Moulin, Capellus, Ramburtius, Maresius, Colvinus, Le Blanc, Le Vasseur, and Alpæus, see 1664.

——— Memoria Thaumasiandri Lutheri Renovata, Gratia Divina adjuvante sub præsidio Johannis Conradi Dannhaweri. pp. iv. 95. 8vo. *Argent.*

Not in Brit. Mus.

——— **Goad** (Thos., *D.D.*) Stimulus Orthodoxus, sive Goadus Redivivus; a Disputation, partly theological, partly metaphysical, etc.

——— **Owen** (John) De Gratia Universali. 4to. *Oxon.*

This is affixed to his work "De Natura." Another ed., *Bremæ*, 1684, 8vo.

——— [**Womoch** (Laur., *D.D.*)] The Result of False Principles. pp. 231. 4to. *Lond.*

Another ed., *Lond.*, 1790, 8vo. The work is written in the Arminian interest. It contains a short account of the Synod of Dort, and to it is added a disputation of Dr. Goades on Necessity and Contingency.

——— **Watson** (Rich., *D.D.*) Epistolaris Diatribe: una de Fide rationali, altera de Gratia salutari, et tractatus de Voluntate liberata: edidit R. Crighton. 12mo. *Lond.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Woelfflinus** (Christ.) Exercitationes de lapsu Adami. 4to. *Tubingæ.*

Other ed., *Tubingæ*, 1662, 1669, 4to, 1706, and 1707, 4to. Also author of "Exemptio electorum, non respondendi de peccatis," *Stuttgart* [1656], 4to.

——— **Gillespie** (Geo.) The Ark of the Covenant opened, or a treatise of the Covenants of Grace and Redemption. 4to. *Lond.*

The 2nd vol. was not pub. till 1677. The author was one of the four commissioners from the Ch. of Scotland to the Westminster Assembly in 1643.

He d. 1648.

——— **Homes** (Nath., *D.D.*) The Resurrection revealed, raised above doubts and difficulties in ten exercitations. fol. *Lond.*

In his collected works, *Lond.*, fol., p. 138 is a sermon on Rom. viii. 29-30, entitled "The Golden Chain of the Divine Act of Salvation." The Resurrection revealed is a peculiar work.

——— **Nicholson** (Will.) An Exposition of the Apostles' Creed. fol. *Lond.*

P. 111, God's power, omnipotency, providence.

Other Ed., 1662: 1663; 1668; 1678,; 1684, 4to; 1844, 8vo; 1849, 8vo.

"A valuable exposition."—*Bickersteth.*

The author was Bishop of Gloucester.

——— Doctrina de Gratia et Prædestinatione. 12mo. *Amst.*

(Calvinistic.)

1661. **Oorschot** (Arnold van) Disputatio de Redemptione. 4to. *Lug. Bat.*

——— **Hauteville** (N. de)Théologie Angélique. 2 vols. 4to. *Lyon.*
Vol. 2. Principle of actions and Grace.

——— **Kohlmeier** (F.) De Prædestinatione. 4to. *Witt.*
Very rare.
This is the 2nd ed., never met with the 1st.

——— **Leonardus** (Tho.) De hominis institutione, corruptione,et reparatione, &c. fol. *Bruxell.*

——— **Vogelius** (Hen.) Disputatio de Plenitudine Gratiæ in Christo. 4to. *Lug. Bat.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Borrull** (Matthias) Tractatus de Voluntate Dei. 4to. p. 507. *Lugd.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Moltke** (Levin-Nicolaus) Tract. de admirando Dei Regimine et singulari Providentia. *Slevici.*

——— **Parpardus** (Joan.) De Fato Physico. 4to. *Witteb.*

——— **Ryssen** (Leon. a.) Synopsis impuræ Theologiæ remonstrantium. 8vo. *Ultraj.*

——— **Saint Joseph** (Pier. à) Response exacte au livre de Denys Raymond, touchant les cinq propositions de Jansenius. 12mo. *Par.*

——— **Titius** (Gerh.) De quorundam Hominum Electione, et quorundam Reprobatione. 4to. *Helmst*

——— **Meisnerus** (Joh.) Disp. de Providentia Dei. 4to. *Witteb.*
Reply to Hoffmann. Author of Disp. de Verbo Dei, cap. iv. sec. 10, dealing with grace.
See too his Fasciulus Disp. Theol.

——— **Weinmannus** (Joh.) Resp. Henharo, Disputatio. 4to. *Altdorf.*
Not in the Brit. Mus
The author was a Lutheran.

——— **Doolittle** (Thomas.) A Sermon concerning assurance. 4to.
Not in the Brit. Mus.

[1661.] **Bulichius** (Titus.) De erroribus Calvinianorum. [*Rost.*]
Not in the Brit. Mus.

1661. **Bois** (Pet. du) Disputatio de Vocatione hominis peccatoris ad Christum 4to. *Lug. Bat.*

——— **Corf** (Jacob) Disputatio de Impotentia hominis ad Bonum. 4to.
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— ——— Disputatio de Promissionibus Divinis. 4to. *Lug. Bat.*
Not in the Brit Mus.

1661. **Coup** (Dan. de) Disputatio de Impotentia hominis ad Bonum. 4to. *Lug. Bat.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.
These 3 last works are rare. Do not remember having met with them except in Dr. Williams's Library.

——— **Fabricius** (Jacob) Disputatio de Vocatione hominis peccatoris ad Christum. 4to. *Lug. Bat.*

1662. **Alderete** (Bernard de) De Prædestinatione et de reprobatione. pp. 554. fol. *Lugd.*
The author was a Jesuit.
See De Backer, vol. 2, p. 10.
This book is not in the Brit. Mus.

——— [**Bourzeis** (l'Abbe de)] S. Augustin victorieux de Calvin et de Molina, ou Réfutation du secret du Jansénisme. 4to.
"L'objet du S. Augustin victorieux, est de justifier ces trois dogmes capitaux du Jansenius; 1o. que Jesus Christ n'est pas mort pour tous les hommes, 2o. que l'homme péche même dans les choses qu'il fait nécessairement. 3o. que la contrainte seule est opposée à la liberté."—*Dict. livr. Jans.*, i. 117.
This book is not under this author in Brit. Mus.

——— **Arnauld** (Ant.) Journal de M. de Saint Amour, de ce qui s'est fait à Rome dans les affaires des cinq Propositions. pp. 578, and p. 286. fol.
Ordered to be burnt by Lewis XIV. by the common hangman 4 Jan., 1664. Transl. into Eng. by G. Havers, *Lond.*, 1664, fol.
This journal, which is very rare, is looked upon by the Jansenists as the most original and essential book which they published after the Augustinus of Jansen and Quesnel's Moral Reflections. It was written by Arnauld and his nephew De Sacy.

——— [**Glanvil** (Jos.)] Lux Orientalis. 12mo. *Lond.*
"A key to unlock the mysteries of providence in relation to man's sin and misery." Reprinted 1682, pp. 276, 8vo.
The author was Rector of Wimbish, Essex, in 1661; Vicar of Frome Selwood, Somersetshire, 1662; Rector of St. Peter and St. Paul, Bath, 1666; and Preb. of Worcester, 1678. He was a Chaplain to Chas. II. and a member of the Royal Society, and d. 1680. He was a warm supporter of the Aristotelian philosopy, and a firm believer in witchcraft. See Athen. Oxon.; Prince's Worthies of Devon.
The 1st ed. is rare.

——— **Lane** (Noel de la) Ecrit du Pape Clement VIII. et conformité de la doctrine soutenue par les disciples de St. Augustin sur les controverses presentes de la grace, etc. 4to. *Colog.*

——— **Fuchs** (Jean) Disputatio theologica de intellectu et voluntate Dei quam in catholico et celebri Lucernensium Lyceo. 12mo. p. 78. *Friburgi. Brisq.*
The author was a Jesuit, Prof. of theology at Lucerne.

1662. Brieven van vernaerde en geleerde mannen.....J. Arminius, Uytenbogaert, H. de Groot, S. Episcopius e. a. over theolog. materieu, den stand der Kerchen betreffenden. 8vo. *Amst.*
Rare. An interesting collection.

——— **Vines** (Rich.) God's drawing and Man's coming to Christ. 4to. *Lond.*
The author was a Presbyterian preacher who became Rector of Weddington, Warwickshire, and after minister of St. Clement's Danes, and Vicar of St. Lawrence, Jewry. One of the Assembly of Divines, 1644 and in 1645, Master of Pembroke Hall, Camb.

——— **Maukischius** (Jo.) Exercit. de Univers. gratia. *Dantisc.*
Another edition, same place, 1667, 4to. Also author of "Maledicentia Maresiana, contra Maresii Disp. de Perseverantia Sanctorum, III Disp. *Dant.*, 1664, 4to.

——— **Titius** (Gerh.) De errore Flacii circa peccatum originis. *Helmstad.*

——— **Raimond** (Denis) [La Lane (Noel de)] Eclaircissement du fait et du sens du Jansenius..... contre les P. P. Amelote. 4to. *Cologne.*

——— **La Lane** (Noel de) Réfutation du livre du R. P. Dom. Pierre de Saint Joseph, intulé: Défense du formulaire. 4to.

——— **Derodon** (Dav.) Disputatio de libertate. 8vo. *Genev.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Maresius** (Sam.) Defensio fidei catholicæ et orthodoxæ de S.S.Trinitate, peccato originali, salute per solum Christum, etc. 4to. *Groninge.*

——— **Bagshawe** (Edw.) The Doctrine of Free Grace cleared, no doctrine of licenciousnesse. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Stearne** (John, *M.D.*, *LL.D.*) Dissert. de Electione et Reprobatione. 4to.
Another ed., *Dubl.*, 1664, 4to.
Stearne was a nephew of Archbp. Usher, Senior Fellow of Trinity Coll., Dublin, and Public Prof. of the University.
D. 1669.

——— **Montanus** (Arn.) Sociniaanse Arminianery. 12mo. *Schoonhoven.*
Arminianism.

1663. **Strauchius** (Ægid.) Jus tertii Orthodoxi circa causam Jesuitico-Jansenianam. 4to. *Witteb.*

——— **A[lleine]** (R.) Vindiciæ Pietatis. 8vo. *Lond.*
Containing The Riches of God's Covenant of Grace.
Another ed., *Lond.*, 1664-66, 8vo; and 1676, 8vo.
Separately pub., *Lond.*, 1666, 12mo, see that date; and *Lond.*, 1831, 12mo.

——— **Henichius** (Jo.) De Gratia et Prædestinatione dissertatio. 4to. *Rintelii.*

——— **Watson** (Thos.) A Divine Cordial: or the transcendant privilege of those that love God and are savingly called. 8vo. *Lond.*
Other ed., *Lond.*, [1830] 12mo, 1831, 12mo. Last ed. 1846, 8vo.
The author was a Noncomformist divine, Rector of St. Stephens, Walbrook, 1643, and ejected for noncomformity 1662; minister of a congregation at Crosby Hall, 1672.
He died 1689.

1663. Conferences entre les sieurs de La Lane et Girard, docteurs en theologie, et le P. Ferrier, Jesuite, touchant les contestations presentes, en présence de M. l'Evêque de Commenge, député par le Roy. 4to. *S.L.*

———[**La Lane** (Noel de)] Memoire pour justifier la conduite des Théologiens qui ne se croyent pas obligez à condamner les cinq propositions du sens de Jansenius, sans explications. 4to.

——— **Martinon** (Jo.) Disputationes Theologicæ. 5 vols. fol. *Burdeq.*
Vol. 2. De Fine ultimo seu beatitudine hominis, de actibus humanis, de Peccatis, de legibus, et de Gratia.
The author was a celebrated Jesuit Theologian. Prof. at Bordeaux, where he d. 1662.

——— **Henricus** (Dan.) Disputationes de æterna hominum credentium electione ad salutem æternam. 4to. *Lips.*

——— **Balzer** (Thos.) Prædestinatio. 8vo. *Witzmar.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Procopius** (Franc.) Prædestinationale, in Predigten. 8vo. *Saltzburg.*

——— Doctrina de Gratia Dei et Prædestinatione nova Methodo tradita. 12mo. *Amst.*

——— **Mackenzie** (Sir Geo.) Religio Stoici, or a short discourse on several divine and moral subjects.
Another ed., *Lond.*, 1713, 8vo, and in vol. 1 of collected works, *Edin.*, 1716, fol.
The author was the well-known lawyer and writer, King's Advocate in 1674, and one of the Lords of the Privy Council in Scotland.
He d. 1691.

1664. [**Arnauld** and **La Lane**] Refutation de la fausse relation du P. Ferrier, Jesuite. 4to.

——— **Ferrier** (Jean) L'idée veritable du Jansenisme, &c. 4to. *Paris.*
Replied to in several pamphlets, one "La Simple verité à la fausse Idée du Jansenisme."—*Paris* pp. 55. This and two other pamphlets by Martin de Barcos.

——— [**De La Lane**] Distinction du sens des cinq Propositions.

——— **Annat** (Franc.) La conduite de l'Eglise et du Roy, justifiée dans la condemnation de l'heresie des Jansenistes. pp. 350. 4to. *Paris.*
The author was a Jesuit.
He attempted to show that the Jansenists were not in agreement with the Thomists, but with the Calvinists.
Not in the Brit. Mus.

1664. **Batelerius** (Jac.) Jacob et Esau: sive explicatio cap. ix, Epist. ad Rom., quo agitur de Jacobi electione et Esau rejectione, ubi de prædestinatione tractatur. 12mo. *Amst.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

Batelerius was the author of various works in favour of the Arminians, which will be found enumerated in Walch, Bibl. Theol., ii. 543. He was written against by Bern. Wyngardus in his work on the 9th Chapter of the Romans. See Lipenius, Bibl. Real. Theolog. ii. 684.

——— **Velthuysen** (Lamb. à) Doctrina de Prædestinatione et Gratia, tradita nova methodo. *Traj. ad Rhen.*

Also in Opera Omnia, *Roterod.*, 1680, 4to, p, 241.

——— **Simonis** (Jo.) Dissertatio de Reprobatione, Respondente Eusebio von Brand. 4to. *Franc.*

"De Fatis hujus dissertationis superiorum jussu suppressæ legantur Nov. Antiqua Theol., 1730, p. 591." Vogt. Cat. Libr. Rar.

——— **Triglandus** (Jac.) Antapologia, sive examen atque refutatio totius apologiæ Remonstrantium. 4to. *Harderv.*

Cap. 25, 26, 29, 31 and 32 (Grace) cap. 31 and 34 (Predestination). See too Walch, Bibl. Theol. ii. 550.

The work is rare.

——— **Bebius** (Philip) Quadriga Pietatis, Tractatus quatuor continens. 1o. Speculum peccatoris et justi, de statu peccati et gratiæ, &c. pp. 261. 24mo. *Colon.*

The author was a Jesuit who d. 1637.

——— **Prideaux** (John, *Bp. of Worcester*) Fasciculus controversiarum theologicarum ad juniorem, editio tertia auctior binis libellis: 1 Theologiæ scholasticæ syntagma: 2 Conciliorum synopsis. 4to. *Oxon.*

P. 100, De Peccato; p. 251, De Redemptione. The 1st edn. was *Oxon.*, 1652, 4to.

——— Syntagma thesium theologicarum in Acad. Salmuriensi variis Temporibus disputatarum. 4 parts in 1 vol. 4to. *Salmur.*

See 1661.

——— **Botsaccus** (Jo.) De libertate veterum doctorum scripta judicandi. 8vo. *Stettin.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Reding** (August) De Deo et attributis. 12mo. *Colon.*

——— **Quenstedt** (Joh. And.) de Causa Peccati. 4to. *Witteb.*

——— **Wellerus** (Jac.) Das Reformati Gott zum Ursacher der Sünden machen. *Braunsch.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— Theses Theologicæ de usu et acceptatione vocis justificandi in scripturis et scholis, &c. 4to. *Sedan.*

——— **Dannhawerus** (Joh. Conr.) Θεῖα Thearchiæ; sive divinæ providentiæ, extra ordinem mira, definita et exemplis illustrata; præside J. C. D. 4to. *Argent.*

Another ed., 1783; which is the only ed. in the Brit. Mus., and *Lips.* 1700, see Schmitz (A.).

1664. **Schmidius** (Sebast.) Brev. Adnotat., quibus beatus pater Martinus Lutherus ab adcusatione, quasi absolutum Calvinianum vel durius aliquod Dei decretum in libro de servo arbitrio statuerit, præcipue vindicatur. 4to. *Argent.*

——— **Bebelius** (Balth.) De sceptiscismo Remonstrantium. 4to. *Argent.*

In Lipenius the date of this work is given as 1646, and this is probably correct.

——— Lettres patentes du Roy, en forme d'Edict, du 29 Mars, 1664, par lesquelles sa Majesté ordonne que les bulles de Papes Innocent X et Alexandre VII au sujet des cinq propositions, etc. 4to. *Par.*

The Declaration of the King of the 29th April, 1665, on the Bull of Alexander VIII., with the formulary to be subscribed by the Clergy on the subject of the five propositions was published in Latin and French, *Par.*, 1665, 4to.

——— **Dannhawerus** (J. Conrad.) Dissertatio theologica de fato flagelli Turcici fatique luce, divinæ iræ, Ottomannica tela in Christianos vibrantis, causas limitesque perpendens. 4to. *Argent.*

Author d. 1651.

——— **Binchius** (Joh.) Entdeckung wider Warenderpii Lehre von Erwählung und Verwerfung der Menschen. 4to. *Franck.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Hauteville** (Nic. de) Eloges sacres de la Redemption. 8vo. *Par.*

——— **Faustus** (Joh.) Disquisitio Theol. ex Act XVII, v. 28, de Divina Motione. *Argent.*

——— **Haberhornius** (Petr.) Dissertatio in librum B. Lutheri de servo Arbitrio, an in illo B. Vir absolutum Decretum defenderit. 8vo. *Giess. Hass.*

Another ed.; 1668, 4to; also author of "Questio an Deus sit causa peccati," *Giessæ*, 4to.

——— **Faustius** (Isa.) Resp. Joh. Dan. Pottenkovero Exercitatio theologica de Præscientia Dei Prædestinantis ad Dictum Rom. viii, v. 29. 4to. *Argent.*

——— **Caton** (Will.) Eine Beschirmung d. Unschüldigen wider die Lästermäuler. pp. 78. 4to. *Amst.*

Original Sin.

——— [**Cudworth** (Ralph, *D.D.*)] Deus Justificatus, or The Divine Goodness vindicated and cleared, against the assertors of absolute and inconditionate Reprobation. 8vo.

Not assigned to him in B. M., and doubtful, most probably by Dr. Womoch, see 1668.

1664. **Sarasa** (Alph. Ant. de) Ars Semper Gaudendi demonstrata ex sola consideratione Divinæ Providentiæ.
2 vols in 1. pp. 418. 4to. *Antwerp.*
Ars semper Gaudendi demonstrat et exponit per præclaros gratosque discursus ac digressiones doctissimas, quibus homo Christianus cum omnia fortuna æque adversa ac prospera docetur componi et ad laetandum omni tempore sive nubilo, sive sereno, et in omni rerum eventu, seu tristi seu læto instituitur ex consideratione divinæ providentiæ, quæ ex parte divini intellectus es Dei sapientia in voluntate, Dei bonitas, Dei æquitas, Dei potentia, bonitas in distributione bonorum æquitas in permissione malorum, potentia, qua facit de malis provenire—*Jo. de Capua. Cathed. Antwerp.* Other ed., *Colon.-Agrip.*, 1676, 4to; *Viennæ*, 1683; *Francof. et Lips.*,, 1741,4to, pp. 274, and 424. This last is edited with a preface by Jo. Pet. Reuschius. Another ed., at last named place, 1750, 2 vols, pp. 312 and 452, 4to. Translated into German, 1749. The author was a Jesuit.

——— Corpus Thesium Theol. Molinæi, Capelli, Rumberti, Maresi et aliorum Theol. Prof. Academ. Sedanensis.
4to. *Genev.*

1665. **Graile** (John) Doctrine of Conditions in the Covenant of Grace against W. E[yre] with a preface by Constant Jessop in vindic. of Dr. Twisse.
4to. *Lond.*

1665-6. **Osiander** (Jo. Ad.) Exercitationes de Nominibus Divinis, Deus ex Lumine Naturæ representatus, et Deus in Lumine Gloriæ delineatus.
4to. *Tubingæ.*

1665. **Senault** (John Francis) L'homme Chrestien, ou la réparation de la nature par la grace. 2 vols. 12mo. *Amst.*
In English, 1650, 4to.

——— Le Père Annat refûté par luy méme; en response aux deux livres du Père Annat qui ont pour titres: La conduite de l'Eglise; et Les remedes contre les scruples. 4to.

——— **Thanner** (J. H.) Disputatio Theologica de Scientia Dei.
8vo. pp. 105. *Ingolstadii.*
The author was a Jesuit, professor of theology of the University of Ingolstadt, and presided at this disputation.

——— **Stoz** (Matthew) Necessitas divinæ gratiæ per Christum, in alma, catholica et Archiducali Universitate Brisgois-Friburgensi Præside Matthæo Stoz, Jesu SS. Theologiæ Pfofessore Ordinario, &c.
12mo. pp. 135. *Friburgi, Bris.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Mauritius** (Comes de Flisco) Decas de Fato, annisque fatalibus tam hominibus quam regnis mundi.
4to. *Francofurti.*
As to this rare and curious work, see *Arpe*, 89. There is a copy in the Bodleian.

1665. **Ziegreus** (Constantine) Dissertatio de Fato. 4to. *Witteb.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.
The author was a Doctor of Theology, and Professor of Physics.

——— **Ford** (Sim.) Christian's Acquiescence in Divine Providence.
8vo. *Lond.*
The author was Vicar of St. Laurence, Reading, 1651; of All Saint's, Northampton, 1659; and of Old Swinford, Worcestershire, 1685. A list of his works will be found in Athen. Oxon.

——— Bulle de Alexandre VII du 15 Fevrier, 1665, contre les cinq propositions extraites du livre de Jansenius, avec la formule de foy de doit estre souscrite par toutes les personnes Ecclesiastiques. 4to. *Par.*
See 1657.

——— **Bedderkopft** (Gabr.) Dissertationes duæ; primà de scepticismo profano et sacro, præcipue Remonstrantium, &c. 4to. *Argent.*

——— **Swiggen** (Joh.) De æterna Dei voluntate omnes salvandi homines, utrum recte dicatur efficax, nec ne?
pp. 68. 4to. *Jenæ.*
Rare.

1666. **Musæus** (Jo.) Exercit. theologic. itemque philosophicarum ut et miscellanearum selectarum. *Marp.*

——— [**De la Lane** (l'Abbé)] Defense des Propositions de la seconde colomne.
4to.

——— Opuscula theologica ad gratiam spectantia. 3 vols. 4to. *Paris.*
"Rien de plus solide, de plus clair, de plus profound et de mieux écrit."—*Dict. liv. Jan.*

——— **Annat** (Franc.) Lettre de M. Jansenius au Pape Urbain VIII, contenant la dédicace de son livre intitulé Augustinus, 4to. pp. 122. *Paris.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Barcos** (Martin de) Explication de la question de fait, touchant les cinq propositions condamnées par les Papes, &c. 4to. *Par.*

——— **Vejelius** (Elias) Exercitatio de Ecclesiâ Græcanicâ, contra L. Allatium, Arcudium et Nihusium.
pp. 44. 4to. *Arg.*
(Free-will.)

——— **Baronius** (Vinc.) SS. Augustini et Thomæ vera mens de libertate humanâ et Gratiâ divina explicatur et Scholæ Thomisticæ asseritur.
8vo. *Paris.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.
The work of a Dominican in answer to Raynaud, the Jesuit's book of 1633.

——— Libri Apologetici pro Religione, utraque Theologia, moribus ac juribus Ord. Prædicatorum (libri tres priores) adversus Theophili Raynaudi tres,

totidem Petre de Alva libros, aliquot Epistolas Jo. Launoji, Expostulationes Carterii. 2 vols. 8vo. *Par.*

1666. **Alleine** (Rich.) Heaven opened; or a brief and plain discovery of the riches of God's covenant of Grace. 8vo. *Lond.*

Another ed., *Lond.*, 1831, 12mo. The original ed. is not in the Brit. Mus.

[1666.] **Acosta** (Ignace) De peccato originali ejusque remedio, Incarnatione Domini. 2 vols.

The author was a Portuguese Jesuit, and a missionary in China. He died in 1666, and the above work is in Chinese.

1666. **Kromayer** (Hier.) Theologia positivo-polemica. 4to. *Francof.*

(Cause of sin, Grace, Election, Pred., and Free-will.)

Other ed., *Francof.*, 1668, 1671, 1683, 4to; *Lips.*, 1687, 1695, 1711, 4to, 2 tom. See Walch i, 60.

——— **Quenstedt** (J. A.) De ἀδύναμια virium hominis irregeniti in spiritualibus. *Vitemb.*

——— **Backerus** (Joannes Ludovicus) Diss. de actuosa Dei providentia circa mala. 4to. *Bartuy.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Greiffensohn** (Sam.) Exempel der Väterlichen Vorsehung Gottes unter einer anmuthigen historie des keuschen Josephs, etc. 8vo. *Hirschfeld.*

——— **Lesle** (Joh. Wilh.) Disputatio Theol. de Providentia Dei. 4to. *Fr. ad Od.*

——— **Wulfferus** (Dan.) Fatum. 12mo. *Nürnberg.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Osiander** (Joh. Adam) Specimen Jansenismi. 4to. *Tubing.*

——— **Brennius** (*or* **Breen**) (Daniel) Opera. fol. *Amst.*

Election.

——— **Bunyan** (John) Grace Abounding. pp. 94. 8vo. *Lond.*

The copy in B. M. is imperfect.

Other ed., *Lond.*, 1688, 8vo; 1692, 12mo; [1693], 12mo; 1701, 12mo: 1716, 12mo; [1750], 12mo; 1759, 12mo; 1761, 12mo; 1771, 12mo; 1778, 12mo; *Leeds*, 1798, 12mo; *Lond.*, [1800], 12mo; 1804 12mo; 1812, 12mo; 1814, 13mo; 1825, 12mo; 1827, 12mo; *Aberdeen* [1830], 8vo; *Lond.*, 1845, 8vo; *Glasgow*, 1863, 12mo; *Lond.*, *Leipzig* [printed], 1864—67, 4to; 1866, 8vo; *Lond.* [1873—76], 4to; *Edinb.*, 1847, 12mo. In Welsh, *Dolgellen*, 1803, 8vo; *Caerfyrdin*, 1830, 12mo.

——— **Binchius** (Joh.) Mellificii Theologici ad Disputandum et concionandum proficui, etc. 5 pts. pp. 280, 196, 284, 196, 308, and Index. 4to. *Amst.*

Pt. 2, p. 44, De Providentia Dei—p. 79, De Prædestinatione—p. 104, De Peccato—p. 178, De libero arbitrio.

1666. **Raimond** (Denis) Esclaircissement du Fait et du Sens de Jansenius. 4to. *Cologne.*

——— **Magellanous** (Pet.) Tract. Theol. de Scientia Dei. 4to. *Olissip.*

1667. **Morus** (Alexander) De Gratia et libero arbitrio.

The author was a French Calvinist of Scottish extraction, Prof. of Greek and afterwards of Divinity at Geneva. B. 1616, d. 1670. He was a good Hebrew and Greek scholar, and is well known for his quarrel with Milton.

——— **Ferrier** (Jean) Refutation d'un libelle publié par les disciples de Jansenius, autre l'écrit intitulé "La soumission apparente des Jansenistes." 4to, pp. 278. *Tolosæ.*

Also author of "Responsiones ad objectiones Vincentianas, seu Argumenta, quibus Vincentius Baronius ex Ord. Præd. Scientiam Mediam impugnat," *Tolosæ*, 1668, 8vo.

——— **Gourboulez** (Joan., *S.J.*) De Prædeterminatione Physica et Decreto Indifferenti. Disputatio bipartita. Juxta veram D. Thomæ doctrinam. Contra R. P. Labat. 12mo, pp. 365. *Tolosæ.*

Another ed.; same place, 1668, 8vo. Neither ed. in Brit. Mus.

The work of Labat was entitled "Theologiæ scholasticæ secundum illibatam D. Thomæ doctrinam, ultima pars seu ultimum complementum, solutionem objectionis intricatissimæ, ac difficillimæ de divinâ gratiâ, cum clarissimâ ejus expositione à pluribus tentatâ, et à nemine hactenus obtenta complectens."

——— **Damvilliers** [Nicole (Pierre)] Les imaginaires et les visionaires, ou lettres sur l'hérésie imaginaire, par le sieur D. 2 vols, 12mo. *Liege.*

——— **Bechmann** (Frider.) Dissertatio academica de scientia Dei, partim Photinianis, partim Calvinianis opposita à F. B. 4to. *Jenæ.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

Also author of "Disputatio Theologica de Universalitate Mortis Christi," *Jenæ*, 1669, 1671, 4to.

——— **Lanterius** (Car.) Tract. Theol. de Virtute Pœnitentiæ Sacramentalis, de libero arbitrio in omni Statu, &c. fol. *Rom.*

——— **Palafox** (Joh.) Charta Pastoralis, Notitiam Divinæ Gratiæ et nostrarum Calamitatum renudans. 12mo. *Machliniæ.*

In Spanish, *Bruselas*, 1653, 12mo.

——— **Rondelet** (Pierre) Sermon de la Persévérance du Fidèle contre Costa. 12mo. *Amst.*

——— **Amyraut** (Moses) Dissert. de libero hominis arbitrio. 8vo. *Salm.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Turrettinus** (Franc.) Exercitationes Theologicæ de libro Vitæ. 4to. *Genevæ.*

1667. **Lubertus** (Henr.) Pusillus Grex Electorum. 12mo. *Tüb.*
Another ed., 1672.

——— **Lullius** (J.) *Resp.* Disputationum theologicarum...decima octava,de lapsu Adami primo. 4to.

1668. **[Womoch** (Laur.) Deus Justificatus; or, Divine Goodness vindicated and cleared against the assertion of absolute and Inconditionate Reprobation. pp. 280, 8vo. *Lond.*
An excessively silly book. See 1664.

——— **More** (Henry) Divine Dialogues containing sundry disquisitions concerning the Attributes and Providence of God. 8vo. *Lond.*
Another ed., *Glasg.*, 1743, 3 vols, pp. 449, 12mo.
Other ed., 1688, 8vo; 1713, 8vo.
Contains some curious information as to the customs of various countries.
"Though his style be now in some measure obsolete and his speakers be marked with the academic stiffness of their times, yet the dialogue is animated by a variety of character and a sprightliness of conversation beyond what are commonly met with in writings of this kind."—*Blair's Lect. on Rhetoric.*

——— **Serarius** (Pet.) Liber quartus Psalmorum in quo grande illud de Redemptione totius Adami, Rerumque Omnium ejus Gratia Restitutione Mysterium, hactenus Mundo absconditum graphice describitur, &c. *Amster.*

——— **[Annat** (Franc.)] La doctrine des Jansenistes contraire au Siege Apostolique et à S. Augustin. 4to. *Par.*

——— **Rutherford** (Sam.) Examen Arminianismi, Edit. Mthi. Netheno. 8vo. *Ultrajecti.*
Another ed., same place, 1688, 12mo.

——— Mémoires sur le grace. 3 vols, 12mo. *Louv.*

——— **Baumannus** (Mich.) Adamum protoplastum. *Norimb.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Joseph** (Pet. a St.) De Deo, gratia divina actuali et habituali; concordia humanæ libertatis cum certitudine prædestinationis, &c. 12mo. *Colon.*

——— **Delidel** (Claude, *S.J.*) La Théologie des Saints; on sont representez les mysteres et les merveilles de la grace. 4to. *Par.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— La défense de Jansenius touchant la soumission de son livre au Pape, &c. 4to.

——— **Placet** (P.) La corruption du monde par le pêchè d'Adam. 12mo. *Paris.*

——— **Richardus** (Jac.) De Libero Arbitrio et Gratia. 4to. *Giessæ.*
Also author of "Agonisma Metaphysico-Theologicum de affectionibus entis et attributis Dei." *Ulmæ*, 1666, 4to.

1668. **Calovius** (Abr.) Controversiarum, quæ ab Arminianis pontificiis, Calvinianis et Novatoribus, syncretistis orthodoxæ ecclesiæ hactenus motæ. 4to.
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Espersa** (Mart. de) De Gratia. 12mo. *Vien.*

——— **[La Lane** (Noel de)] Conformité des Jansénistes avec les Thomistes sur le sujet des cinq propositions, &c. pp. 32, 4to.
2nd Ed., pp. 126, 4to.

1668—9. Deux Recueils de plusieurs Actes, Declarations et autres Piéces qui servent à prouver, le premier la pureté de la foi des Disciples de S. Augustin sur les cinq propositions, &c. pp. 291, 12mo

1668. **Ferguson** (Rob.) Justification only upon a satisfaction. 12m. *Lond.*
The author was ejected from his living of Godmarsham, Kent in 1662. He was engaged in controversy with Dr. Sherlock, see *Orme.*, *Bibl. Bib.*

——— The Freeness of God's Grace in the Forgiveness of Sins, vindicated against the doctrine of Mr. Ferguson. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Faustius** (Isaac) *Resp.* Joh. Erasm. Klein. Disputatio de Scientia Dei. 4to. *Argent.*

1669. **Platel** (Jacq.) Auctoritas contra Prædeterminationem physicam pro scientia media, cum brevi historia complectente ortum; pugnus et palmas ejusdem scientiæ mediæ. 12mo. *Duaci.*

——— **Barnes** (Joshua) Sacred Poems in five books.—II, The Fall of Adam and the Redemption of Christ.
Professor of Greek, Camb., 1695, and died 1715.

——— **Tricassinius** (Car. Jos.) Disputatio theologica de prædestinatione hominum ad gloriam. 4to. *Par.*

——— **Sales** (St. F. de) Sentimens touchant la Grace. 12mo. *Par.*

[1669.] **Mossinus** (J.) Exercitatio de æterna Dei providentia contra atheos, *&c.*, Præs. Bircherod (J.) 4to.

1669. **Leon** (Carme de l'Observ. de Rennes) Théâtre de la Providence. 8vo. *Paris.*

——— **Whitehead** (Geo.) A brief examination of the doctrine concerning election and reprobation of persons, &c. 4to.
Very rare.

——— **Nethenus** (Math.) Defensio concordiæ Pastorum Ultraj. contra Maresium. 4to. *Amstel.*

1669. **Mullerus** (Joh. Jac.) Dist. Theol. super cap. IX., XI., XII., et XIII., Epistolæ ad Romanos. 4to. *Jenæ.*

——— **Gale** (Thos.) Court of the Gentiles.
See 1682.

——— **Gray**, Great and Precious Promises, and on Assurance. 18mo. *Edinb.*

——— **Perez** (Antoine) Tractatus sex, II. De divina Gratia auxiliante. fol. *Lugd.*
A Jesuit of high reputation who died in 1649.

——— **Nuney de Miranda** (Ant.) MS. Tractatus de Auxiliis Gratiæ.
The author was a Jesuit who died in 1695.
The MS. above is in the Library of the University of Mexico. De Bacher, iv., 485.

——— **Reveau** (Geor.) [**Spanheim** (Ezech.)] Epistola ad Pamphilum, de gratia universali judicium. 8vo. *Lug. Bat.*

——— **Marinarius** (F. Ant.) Ord. Carm. Episc. Tagast. In materia de gratia verus Augustinus, adversus Jansenii opus, cui titulus : Augustinus. 4to. *Velitris.*

——— **Rudrauffius** (Kilianus) Triga dissertationum de potentia, scientia et voluntate Dei, præside K. R. 4to. *Giessæ.*

——— **G[ale]** (T.) The True Idea of Jansenisme, both Historick and Dogmatick. pp. 166, 12mo. *Lond.*
An able and valuable little work. It is rare. It has a preface by John Owen.

——— **Mœbius** (Georg.) Exercitatio Theologica de Universali Dei Voluntate circa salutem hominum. 4to. *Lips.*

1670. **Heinius** (Jo.) Vindiciæ Præsentiæ specialis contra Wigandum. 8vo. *Marp.*

——— [**Gerberon** (Gabr.)] Miror de la piété Chrétiénne.
Treats of Predestination, Grace, and Free will.

——— Testimonia primæ, mediæ et ultimæ ætatis Christianæ doctorum eorum que non infimæ auctoritatis quod satisfactio Christi divini duntaxat decreti ratione et ob congruentiam, non vero absolute necessaria fuerit. 4to.

——— **Loftus** (Dudley, *D.D.*) Reductio Litium ad Arbitrium boni veré de Prædestinationis et Reprobatis. *Dubl.*
"Vir doctissimus, tam generis prosapia, quam singularum orientalium scientia nobilis."—*Brian Walton.*

——— **Firmin** (Giles) The real Christian ; or, a Treatise of Effectual Calling. 4to. *Lond.*
The author was a Nonconformist, a native of Suffolk, who emigrated to New England and practised physic. He afterwards returned and became minister of Stratford, Essex, and was ejected in 1662.

1670. **Mlodzianowski** (Thos.) Prælectiones theologicæ de peccatis et gratia. pp. 4, 443 and 10, fol. *Cracoviæ.*
The author was a Jesuit who died 1686.
Date in Lipenius, Bibl. Real. Theol., ii., 456, 1671.

——— [**Henneguier** (Hier.)] Vanitas triumphorum quos ab Auctoritate Prædeterminationes Physicas pro scientia media erigere nititur Germanus Philalethes Eupistinus, auctore amico Philalethi consentaneo. pp. 374, 12mo. *Duaci.*
The work was so able as to change the sentiments of his adversary.

——— **Fasseau** (Paul.) Authoritas Germani Philalethis, Eupistini, contra præmotiones physicas pro scientia media, exauthorata pro præmotionibus physicis contra scientiam mediam. 8vo. *Duaci.*

——— **Sterry** (Peter) Free Grace exalted. pp. 15, 4to.
This tract is very rare, recently priced at £1 5s.
It is not in the Brit. Mus

——— **Scheelen** (Petrus) Fallstriet Adams oder Beschreihung des fläglichen Sünden-Falls der ersten Menschen. 4to. *Nurnb.*

1671. **Zagalia** (Joseph) Cursus theologicus de Deo secundum mentum ac... doctrinam Joa. Bacconi.
6 vols, & sup. 1 vol. *Ferrariæ et Parmæ.*
Vol 4.—De Deo prædestinante et reprobante.
Sup.—De voluntate humana....ultima fine, &c.

——— Prières pour demander à Dieu la Grace d'une véritable conversion. 12mo.

——— **Brandt** (G.) Histoire der Reformatio en and. kerkelijke geschiedenissen in en ontrent de Nederlanden, tot 1623, 2e verb. druk. 4 vols, 4to. *Amst.*
Other ed., *Amstel. and Rotterdam*, 1677—1704, 4 vols, 4to.
Translated into English, *Lond.*, 1719—1720, 2 vols, fol. ; *Lond.*, 1720--23, 4 vols, fol.
The ed. of 1671 is not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Boscius** (Joh.) Predigten von der Gnade, ex Epes., ii., 8. 8vo.
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Pierce** (Thos.) Collection of Sermons upon several occasions, with notes, God's Decrees, especially of Reprobation.
See 1657.

——— **Du Bosc** (Pierre) Quatre Sermons les Larmes de S. Pierre, la Doctrine de la Grace, &c. 8vo. *Genev.*

——— **Baxter** (Rich.) God's goodness vindicated. 12mo. *Lond.*
On the Doctrine of reprobation and damnation.

1671. **Calovius** (Abr.) Consideratio Arminianismi. 4to. *Vitemb.*
Best ed. 3rd ed., *Wittemb.*, 1761.
Neither ed. in Brit. Mus.

——— **Truman** (Jos.) Discourse on Natural and Moral Impotency. 8vo. *Lond.*
Another ed., *Lond.*, 1675, pp. 224, 12mo. Also with Biog. Intro. by Henry Rogers, 1834, sm. 8vo.
Truman was an able writer, taking much the same view as Baxter. He was a learned metaphysician, ejected in 1662 from the living of Cromwell for nonconformity. He died 1671.

——— Sebastianum ab Alexandro Canaelita. Liber pensilis in cujus gemina hanc prædestinati e reprobi quod ommerum pensitantur. 4to. *Romæ.*

——— **Gerhardus** (Joh. Ern.) De Salute infantium ante Baptismum decedentium. 4to. *Jenæ.*
Another ed., same place and size, 1679.

——— [**Nicole** (Pierre) or **Arnauld** (Ant.)] Préjugez Légitimes contres les Calvinistes. 12mo. *Paris.*
Another ed., 1683 ; *Rouen*, 1725, 12mo.

——— Korte Historie van het Synode van Dordrecht. 12mo. *Goudæ.*

——— Censur und Historia des Dordrechtischen Synodi, so Jeso erst aus etlichen Schreiben II., Calvinischen als M. Joh. Hales und D. Walther Balcanqual au H. Dudæus Carldon damahligen Englischen Ambassadeur in Haag überseset von Dan. Hartnaccio. 12mo. *Zeis.*

——— **Liebhardus** (Lub.) Brevis et succinta inter Protestantes invariatæ August. Confess. addictos et Calvinoreformatos Historia. 4to. *Jenæ.*
This work was attacked by Jo. Christ. Becmannus under the title of "Orthnini Gratii Castigationes," *Franc. ad. Oder.*, 1672, 4to.

——— **Bridge** (Will.) The freeness of the grace and love of God to believers. sm. 8vo. *Lond.*
The author was a Congregationalist and a Calvinist.

——— **Herrera** (Augustin de) Tractatus de Prædestinatione sanctorum, et impiorum Reprobatione. pp. 454. 4to. *Compluti.*
The author was a Jesuit, and wrote a treatise "De Voluntate Dei," *Compl.*, 1675, 4to.

——— **Ortega** (Christop. de) Theologia controversiarum dogmaticarum Scholasticarum... ..de decreto concurrendi cum causis liberis. 2 vols. fol. *Lugd.*
Vol I—Scientia et decreto concurrendi cum causis liberis ; vol II—De Voluntate, Providentia Prædestinatione, Reprobatione, &c. The author was a Jesuit, d. 1676. Another ed., *Lugd.*, 1680, 2 vols, fol. See Hurter ii, 347.

[1671.] Oracula divina magni Apostoli Pauli de gratia Dei, à sanctis Augustino et Thoma Aquinate, excerpta et exposita. 4to. *Massiliæ.*

1671. Quæstio Theologica de gratia justificante, propugnata ab una congregatione Patrum Oratorii in ædibus Ardilliensibus, die 7 Augusti, 1671. 4to. *Salm.*

——— **Varenius** (Aug.) Resp. Lütkemann, De Peccato originali dissertatio. 4to. *Rost.*

1672. **Arandus**—Providence ; or Arandus and Emilee. A Poem. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **C[rane]** (T[hos.]) Isagoge ad Dei Providentiam ; or a Prospect of Divine Providence. 8vo. *Lond.*
"A valuable work."—*Bickersteth.*
The author was a Lancashire man, and probably also author of "Hull's pillar of Providence erected," *Lond.*, 1643, 4to.

——— **Arnauld** (Ant.) Le Renversement de la Morale de Jésus Christ, par les Erreurs des Calvinistes, touchant la Justification. 4to. *Paris.*
Reprinted 1713, 4to.
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Ives** (Jeremy) Two disputations between him and Mr. Dawson concerning Perseverance and Apostacy. 8vo.

——— **Swinnocke** (Geo.) Treatise on the Incomparableness of God in His Being, Attributes, Works, etc. 8vo.

——— [**Fouilloux** (Jacq.] Hist. abrégée du Jansénisme. *Cologne.*
Another ed., *Col.*, 1698, 12mo.

——— [**Brias** (Car. de)] Thomistarum Triumphus id est Sanctorum Augustini et Thomæ gemini Ecclesiæ solis summa concordia I.—De Scientia Mediâ. III.—De libertate, etc. 4to. *Duaci.*

——— The Life and Death of James Arminius and Simon Episcopius. 12mo. *Lond.*

——— **Wilkius** (Joh.) Gedanchen über die Vorsehung Gottes. 8vo. *Basel.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Erasmus** (Chr. a) De certitudine salutis. 4to. *Witteb.*

——— **Gejerus** (Mart.) Allgegenwart Gottes. 8vo. *Leipz.*

——— **Truman** (Joseph) The Great Propitiation. 2nd ed. pp. 374, 12mo. *Lond.*
The author takes much the same view as Baxter.

1673. **Wems**, *or* **Yvon** (Pet.) Lehre von der Göttlichen Prædestination. 8vo. *Alten.*
The author was a Lutheran.
An ed. in Latin, *Amst.*, 1681, 12mo.
Not in Brit. Mus.

——— **Bruguer** (J.) Réponse sommaire au livre intitulé, Le Renversement de la Morale de Jésus Christ, par les erreurs des Calvinistes. 12mo.
Not in the Brit. Mus.

1673. **Long** (Thos.) Calvinus Redivivus or Conformity to the Church of England in doctrine, government and worship, persuaded by Mr. Calvin.
sm. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Gariner** (Jean) Marii Mercatoris Augustino Æqualis opera quæcumque extant. 2 parts. pp. 433 and 364.
fol. *Paris.*

The first part is an account of the heresy of Pelagius.

——— **Tricassinius** (Car. Jos.) Tractatus de necessaria ad salutem gratia omnibus et singulis data secundum Augustinum. 4to. *Paris.*

——— Præclara et solida de Prædestinatione physica Disputatio ad utilitatem Scholarium contra acerrimos illius impugnatores, ex Doctrinâ Germani Philalethis Enpistini, in suo Thomistarum Triumpho nervosè deducta, per Theologum Lovaniensem. p. 35.
4to. *Brux.*

——— **Coles** (Elisha) A Practical discourse of God's Sovereignty.
4to. *Lond.*

Numerous edit., the 3rd *Lond.*, 1678, 8vo; 7th, *Lond.*, 1718, 8vo; another 1753. The 14th in 1768, *Lond.*, 8vo; another *Lond.*, 1794, 8vo; *Edinburgh*, 1798, 12mo; *London*, 1816, pp. 312, 12mo. Reprinted in 1835, 12mo; and *Dublin*, 1855, 8vo. A recent ed. with pref. by C. H. Spurgeon. Ryland pronounces the book to be "one of the most useful and best known to all experimental Churches of any written in our language." Dr. Williams says "If the doctrines contained in the book be not true, I have no hope of going to heaven." Let us hope he has discovered his hope had better foundation! Romaine says of the book, "The doctrines of grace, of which the book treats, are the truths of God; our author has defended them in a masterly manner." The work is undoubtedly able from the hyper-Calvinist's point of view, but discloses an utter inability to grasp the real points of issue with the Arminians. Throughout men of straw are erected, then demolished. Dr. Kippis states that the book was put into his hands when 13 or 14 years of age, to instruct and confirm him to the Supralapsarian point of view, but that the reading of it produced a contrary effect. He considered the author's statements of the objections to his own views appeared to him stronger than his own answers, so that to this work he owed his first renunciation of Calvinism.

——— **Polhil** (Ed.) The Divine Will, considered in its Eternal Decrees and holy execution of them. 8vo. *Lond.*

The author was a learned layman of Burwash in Sussex. This work is Calvinistic, and has been reprinted during the present century.

——— **Powell** (Vasasor) Description of the threefold state of our Elect person, viz., of Nature, Grace and Glory.
Lond.

A zealous itinerant preacher, often in bonds, and d. in the Fleet prison.

——— **Episcopius** (Sim.) The Popist's Labyrinth, with the Life and death of the author, as also the life and death of Jas. Arminian, Transl. from the Dutch by J. R. 12mo.

1673. **Ferguson** (Robt.) Discourse of Moral Virtue and Grace. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— Juliani, Eclanensis Episcopi, libellus fidei, missus ad sedem Apostolicam in causa Pelagianorum. 8vo. *Paris.*

——— **Isingius** (J. C.) Gründl. Anweisung von der ewigen-Gnadenwahl, etc.
4to. *Dantz.*

——— ——— Anweisung von der Person Christi von der ewigen fürsehung und allgewaltigen Regierung.
4to. *Dantz.*

——— **Burignon** (Ant.) Fürnembste Irrthümer, sampt der wahren Lehre von der Prædestination und Erklärung des IX cap. ad Rom. durch. P. Yvon.
8vo. *Alton.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Cackeran** (D. Jos.) Theologia Assertiva complectens Tractatus Scholasticos nova methodo utilitati ac brevitati maxime accommodata dispositos.
4 vols. fol. *Lugd.*

Vol 2, De Gratia.
Not in the Brit. Mus.
Date in Lipenius Bibl. Real. Theol., vol. 1, 744, 1678.

——— **Hickman** (Hen.) Historia Quinquarticularis Exarticulata: or animadversions on Dr. Heylin's Quinquarticular history. sm. 8vo. *Lond.*

2nd Ed., *Lond.*, 1674, pp. 237, sm. 8vo.
The author was a noncomformist divine, Fell. of Magdalen Coll., Oxf., deprived at the Restoration. He was a Calvinist, and attempts to prove that the doctrine of the Arminians is contrary to that of the Church of England. The book is valuable to read with Dr. Heylin's work.

——— **Hales** (John) Golden Remains, also Letters and Expresses concerning the Synod of Dort not before printed.
4to. *Lond.*

The 1st edition of the Golden Remains, *Lond.*, 1659, 4to. Other editions, *London*, 1688, 8vo; Translated into German, *Gudæ*, 1671; *Hagæ Comit.*, 1672, 12mo. Works, *Glasgow*, 1765, 3 vols, 12mo. See as to this book and its references to the Synod of Dort, *Walch, Bibl. Theol.*, iii, 851. Hales is known as the "ever memorable." He was Canon of Windsor in 1639, and ejected in the Rebellion.

——— **Pajon** (Claude) Examen du livre qui porte pour titre, "Préjudez legitimes contre les Calvinistes. 2 vols.
12mo. *Charent.*

A 2nd ed., same place, 1683, 2 vols, 12mo.

——— **Browne** (Jas.) Scripture Redemption freed from Man's Restriction.
4to. *Lond.*

This is a reply to a work by W. Throughton. The author was a Chaplain in the Parliamentary Army, and of uncertain views; he is said to have become more orthodox after the Restoration, see *Athen. Oxon.*

1673. **Michaël** (Joh.) Biga Qq. Theol. quarum post. de Peccati Originis Robore ad damnandum. 4to. *Griphis.*

——— **Noris** (Hen. de) Historia Pelagiana, et dissertatio de Synodo quinto Œcumenica. 2 tom. fol. *Patav.*

Other ed., *Bruxell*, 1676; *Amst.*, 1677; *Lovan.*, 1702, fol.; *Patav*, 1677, fol.; 1708, 3 vols, fol. His Opera Omnia, *Ver.*, 1729—32. 4 vols, fol. The eds. of 1673 and 1708 only in the Brit. Mus.

Noris was one of the most learned, most celebrated, and as a critic one of the most judicious men that Italy has produced. His history of Pelagianism, however, which first brought him into repute occasioned him to be cited before the Inquisition, and to be regarded as a Jansenist. To the edition of 1702, is added five historical dissertations. See Journal des Savans, 1703, Jan., p. 3, Clerici Biblioth., tom. 1, p. 13; Bernard's Nouvelles de la republique des Lettres, 1702, Dec., p. 654.

1674. **Marshall** (Chas.) Way of Life Revealed. pp. 35. 4to.

Treats of the Fall and Recovery.

——— **Thomas** (Edward) The Estate of Man by Nature and Grace, with Meditations, etc. 8vo. *Lond.*

[1674.] **Bunyan** (John) Reprobation asserted; or the Doctrine of Eternal Election and Reprobation. 4to. *Lond.*

Another ed., *Lond.*, 1696, 4to. In Welsh, *Caerfryddin*, [1780] 8vo.

1674. [**Humphrey** (J.)] Middle Ways —between Arminian and Calvinist, Orthodox and Quaker, Legalist and Antinomian, Protestant and Papist. 4to.

——— **Phelpes** (Charles) Calling and election: or, many called but few chosen, being a consideration on Matt. xxii, 14. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Avendano Eztenaga** (Michel de) De Divina Scientia et Prædestinatione. 3 vols. fol. *Lasscinensi.*

Vol. 1. De Scientia, p. 318 and 353.
Vol. 2. De Prædestinatione, pp. 484.
Vol. 3. De Concordiæ Scientiæ et Prædestinationis cum libertate, pp. 210 and 166.
The author was a Jesuit.
The work is not in the Brit Mus.

——— **Talbot** (Peter) Historia Manichæismi et Pelagianismi in qua ostenditur supra memoratum æbium seu Blacloum, ejusque assedas Hæreses suscitare. 8vo. *Par.*

Another ed., Latin and English, *Gaudavi*, 1675, 4to.

The author was a Jesuit, died in 1680, see De Bacher, v. 717.

The above volume respecting the Papal Supremacy (written against Serjeant's *Sure Footing*) is a curious work. It was secretly printed abroad under the name of M. Lomino, but its real author was Peter Talbot, brother to the Earl of Tyrconnell, Almoner to Catherine, Queen of Charles II., who advanced the Catholic cause so much in Ireland, that Pope Clement IX appointed him Archbishop of Dublin, but the Protestants afterwards arrested him, and he is said to have died in prison from want in 1682.

1674. **Musæus** (Pet.) Dissertatione, qua locus Paulli Rom. v. 12 in quo omnes peccarunt, consideratur. *Kilon.*

Another ed., *Tub.*, 1718.

——— **Affelmannus** (Joh.) De Perseverantia Sanctorum, extat in Syntagm. Exercit. 4to. *Lips.*

——— Göttliche Gedanken über die zierlichen Ordnungen, die bei der Vorsehung Gottes zu spüren. 12mo. *Bas.*

——— **Siebenburger** (Geo. Wolf.) Gründliche und Schriftliche Antwort und Gegensatz auff der Calvinischen Lehre von der Gnadenwahl. 4to. *Franck.*

——— **Rous** (Franc.) Grande Oraculum Salutem Hominis in efficaci Dei Gratia, non in libertate humanæ Voluntatis esse positam. Extat in Interioribus Regni Dei. 12mo. *Lond.*

Trans. into English, *Lond.*, 1718.

——— **Rirner** (Hen.) *Resp.* Henr. Affelmanno de certitudine Gratiæ Dei et Remissionis Peccatorum. 4to. *Helmst.*

——— **Bates** (William, *D.D.*) The Harmony of the Divine Attributes in the Redemption of Man. 4to. *Lond.*

"Bates on the Attributes is too much confined to one to answer the purposes of a practical familiar treatise."—*Bickersteth.*

This 1st ed. not in the B. M.

2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1675; 3rd, 1688, 8vo; 4th, *Lond.*, 1697, 8vo.

1700, fol; *Lond.* [*Leeds printed*] 1815, 8vo; 1826, 8vo; 1835, 8vo; *Lond.*, [1840], 8vo.

The author was an eminent noncomformist, Vicar of St. Dunstan's in the West; refused the Deanery of Lichfield and Coventry. He was one of the Commissioners at the Savoy conference in 1669, for reviewing the Liturgy, etc. He d. 1699. His whole works were published in 1815, 4 vols, roy. 8vo.

1675. Apologie pour la Morale des Réformez, ou defense de leur doctrine touchant.....la Persévérance des vrais Saints, etc. pp. 544. 8vo. *Rouen.*

This is a reply to Arnauld.

——— **Werner** (Sam.) De Salute Infantis. 4to. *Regiomonti.*

——— **Baxter** (Rich.) Two disputations of Original Sin. pp. 245. 8vo. *Lond.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

Written on the invitation of Dr. T. Tullie.

Treats of "Original sin as from Adam," and of "Original sin as from our neerer parents."

——— ——— Catholick Theologie for pacification of the Dogmatical Word-warriours. pp. 136, 118, 229. fol. *Lond.*

On God's Decrees, Foreknowledge, Providence, the Five Points, &c. On the title page "written for posterity, when sad experience hath taught men to hate Theological logical Wars, and to love and seek and call for peace.—(*ex Bello Pax.*)"

——— **Caramuel** (Jo.) Dialexis de non-Certitudine. fol. *Lugd.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

1675. **[Barret** (John)] On the Covenant of Works and Grace. pp. 494. 8vo. *Lond.*

Very rare.
Not in Brit. Mus.
Author of Disc. on the Covenants and Works of Grace, 1678, 8vo.

——— **Curcellæus** (Steph.) Opera Theologiæ. fol. *Amst.*

Contains—De Jure Dei in Creaturas innocentes —Inst. Re.Christ.—De Ecclesia Christi.—Dissert. Quatern.—Disp. de Pecc. Orig. Adv. Maresium.
The author was a great defender of Arminian doctrine, succeeding Episcopius as Divinity Prof. He d. 1675. A description of his works will be found Walch. Bibl. Theol. ii. 540, 541.

——— **Sterry** (Peter) Discourse on the Freedom of the Will. fol. *Lond.*

The author was Fell. of Emanuel Coll., Camb., 1636, and subsequently one of the Assembly of Divines, and one of Cromwell's Chaplains.
He was an able mystical writer.

——— **Jurien** (Pierre) La Justification de la morale des Reformez. 2 vols.

Another ed.. *Hag. Com.*, 1685, 2 vols.
Against the accusations of Arnauld.—The author was a minister of the French Ch. at Rotterdam and celebrated for his opposition to Bayle.
He d. 1713.

——— **Grotius** (Hugo) Of Grace, of Free-will, of Assurance, of Salvation, etc. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Augustin de Herrera**.—De Voluntate Dei. 4to. *Compluti.*

Not in Brit. Mus.

——— **Noris** (Hen. de) Vindiciæ Augustinianæ, quibus sancti doctoris scripta adversus Pelagianos ac semi-Pelagianos à recentiorum censuris asseruntur. 4to. *Brux.*

——— **Kilian** (C. A.) De universalitate gratiæ divinæ, prout illa in loco, 1 Tim. ii. 4. 4to. *Jenæ.*

1676. Confession or Declaration of Ministers in the United Provinces called Remonstrants or Arminians, translated by T. T. 8vo.

This is one of those two or three books which it said Jeremy Taylor would next to the Bible have preserved from the supposed total destruction of books.

——— **Baius** (Mich.) Opera. 4to. *Colon.*

Another ed. same place and size 1696, by Gerberon.—The 79 or 80 propositions of Baius on Grace, on the liberty of the will, &c., were condemned in 1566 by a Bull of Pius V. and confirmed by one of Gregory XIII. Baius retracted all his errors. The Author was in the opinion of Mosheim equally remarkable for his piety and the extent of his learning. Peignot, in his Dict. des Œuvres condamnées, says, "les œuvres de Baius ont été condamnés, parce qu'il semblait que l'auteur y faisait revivre divers points de la doctrine de Calvin."

——— Centuria colloquiorum Dei et animæ, quibus Jansenianam de gratia doctrinam compendiariis transducere conatus est Jo. Wierts. 4to. *Antv.*

1676. Fatalem rerum necessitatem sub præsidio Christiani Donati. 4to.

Donatus was a Prof. of Logic and Metaphysics in *Wurtemberg.*

——— **Petersenius** (Jo. Guil.) Apologia pro justitia causæ quæstionis: an Deus ab æterno aliquos citra ullum Christi et Fidei respectum dilexerit contra Reinh. Pauli. 4to. *Giessæ.*

——— ——— Justitia causæ de quæstione: an Deus ab æterno, juxta reformatorum sententiam, aliquos amore Benevolentiæ citra ullum Christi et fidei respectum dilexerit, etc. 4to. *Jenæ.*

——— **Erdmannus** (Herm.) Victorinus devictus, id est, de Victorini Strigelii synergismo dissertatio.

See Lipenius, Bibl. Theol., pt. ii., 790.

——— **Hulsius** (Antonius) Specim. Theol. hypotheticæ quæ vulgo Cocceiana vocatur. 2 vols, 8vo. *Lug. Bat.*

——— **Risbrochius** (Fulg.) Henricus Noris dogmatistes, Augustino injurius, summis Pontificibus, sanctis Patribus, Doctoribus scholasticis infestus demonstratus. 8vo. *August.*

——— **Magellanous** (Pet.) Tract. de Prædestinationis executione. 8vo. *Lugd.*

——— **Hopner** (P.) De propitiatione Christi pro peccatis totius mundi ex 1 Joh. ii. 2. 4to. *Lips.*

——— **Deutschmannus** (Joh.) Resp. Jüssel de Certitudine nostræ salutis. 4to. *Vitemb.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Neusser** (Brun.) Prodromus Velitaris. fol. *Mogunt.*

Another ed., *same place*, 1686, fol.
This is a vindication of Augustine, Baronius, Bellarmine, and others, from the charges contained in Noris's Hist. of Pelagianism.

——— **Maurus** (Silv.) Quæstionum Theologicarum. 12mo. *Romæ.*

Contains: lib. 2, Tractatus de Voluntate Dei, de Providentia, et Prædestinatione, &c.; lib 4, Tractatus de libero, de Peccato actuali, &c.; lib. 5, Tract. de Gratia actuali auxiliante, et Gratia habituali justificante, &c.
The author was a Jesuit, Prof. of Theology at Rome, and died 1687.

——— **Loveday** (Sam.) Personal Reprobation reprobated. pp. 334, 12mo. *Lond.*

This is an Exposition of the 9th of Romans, and the author denies any such teaching there as the doctrine of personal reprobation.
The work is not of any value.

——— **Lemos** (Thos. de) Panoplia Gratiæ. 2 vols, fol. *Leodii.*

The author was a Roman Catholic.

——— **Love** (Christ.) XV Sermons on Grace. 8vo.

Also in the second vol of Works, *Dalry*, 1805, 8vo, in which vol will be found "The Christian's Directory, tending to guide him in those several conditions which God's providence may cast him into."

1676. **Dixon** (Rob., *D.D.*) The Nature of the Two Testaments; or, the Disposition of the Will and Estate of God to Mankind. 2 vols, fol. *Lond.*
The author was Prebendary of Rochester.

——— **[Gerberon** (Gabr.)] Mémorial Historique, de ce qui s'est passé depuis l'année 1647, jusqu' à l'an 1653, touchant les cinq Propositions, tant à Paris qu' à Rome.
Also the author, without date, of "Doctrina vera Sancti Thomæ de gratiâ sufficienti."

——— **[Dubois]** De la Predestination des Saints et du don de la Persévérance. 12mo. *Paris.*
This is a translation of the two works of Augustine, with explanatory notes by the translator, in which he passes beyond the guarded language of the Father, and holds views more distinctly Calvinistic.

——— **Broke** (Henricus Matthias de) *Resp.* Dissertatio de vitæ humanæ termino quomodo sit a Deo præstitutus, *Præs.* T. Bechmann. 4to. *Jenæ.*

——— **Buchius** (Philip) Fabula Hæreseos Prædestinatianorum, infamandæ Orthodoxiæ a Gratiæ divinæ adversariis olim confictæ, et seculo nostro in scenam productæ, adscititia vera specie exuta. 4to. *Francof. ad Oder.*
Very rare.
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Barclay** (Robt.) Apologia Theologicæ vere Christianæ. pp. xxii., 374, xxv., 4to. *Amst.*
This original ed. is very rare.
The 4th proposition is concerning the condition of man in the fall; the 5th, the Universal Redemption by Christ; and the 9th is of perseverance, and the possibility of falling from grace, 2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1729, 8vo.
The 1st English ed., [*Aberdeen*], 1678, 4to, pp. xxiv., 412, xxvii.
Another ed. [*Lond.*], 1678, 8vo, pp. 392; 4th, *Lond.*, 1701, 8vo; 5th, *Lond.*, 1703, 8vo; 6th, *Lond.*, 1736, 8vo; 7th, *Dubl.*, 1737, 8vo; 7th in English, *Lond.*, 1765, 8vo; 8th in English, *Birmingham*, 1765 4to; 9th in English, *Philadelphia*, 1775, 8vo; 8th ed., *Lond.*, 1780, 8vo; 9th, *Dublin*, 1800, 8vo; *Lond.*, 1825, 8vo; *New York*, 1827, 8vo; *Lond.*, 1841, 8vo; *Lond.*, *Brighton* [printed], 1849, 8vo; *Manchester*, 1850, 8vo; abridged, *Lond.*, 1815, 12mo; *Lond.*, 1822, 8vo; *Sunderland*, 1817, 8vo. In Dutch, *Amst.*, 1757, 4to. In French, *Lond.*, 1702, 8vo; 1797, 8vo. In German, 1684, 8vo; [*Leipsic?*] 1740, 8vo; *Germantown*, 1776, 8vo.
Spanish ed., Transl. by Alvardo (Felix Anton de), 1710, 8vo.
The author was the celebrated Quaker, d. 1690, see Sewell's Life and Hist. of the Quakers.

——— **Scherzer** (Jo. And.) Divina Thesis hominum von ad Iram sed Salutis acquisitionem 1 Thess., v. 4to. *Lips.*

——— **Holstius** (Joh.) Sonus in omnem Terram. 4to. *Dantis.*
On the call of men.

[1676]. **Brendel** (Joannes Casparus) *Resp.* Dissertatio de prædeterminatione causarum secundarum, *Præs.* M. Palumbini. 4to. *Jenæ.*

1676. **Rappoldus** (Frid.) Hymnus Ecclesiasticus de Gratia Justificationis. 4to. *Lips.*

——— **Pisetzkius** (Adam.) Tractatus Theologico-Historicus de castigationibus et pœnis temporalibus ac æternis lapsum hominis concomitantibus. 12mo. *Dresdæ.*

——— **Kriegsmann** (Joh. S.) Halt was du hast das ist was wir in Christo haben und wie wir es behalten sollen. *Giessen.*

1677. **Benjumea** (Blasius a) Opera theologica. 5 tom., fol. *Lugd. Bat.*
Containing De Gratia, scientia, &c.

——— **E** (R.) A Discourse concerning the period of human life: whether mutable or immutable. 8vo. *Lond.*
E (R.) also wrote a defence of this work, *Lond.*, 1678, 16mo.

——— **Howe** (John) The Reconcileableness of God's Prescience of the sins of man with the wisdom and sincerity of His counsels and exhortations, in a letter to the Hon. Rob. Boyle. pp. 154, sm. 8vo. *Lond.*
Rare.
Howe published a Postscript (pp. 52) to this letter same year. He was the eminent Non-conformist Divine, Fell. of Magdalen Coll., Oxford, Minister of Great Farrington, Devon, and Domestic chaplain to Oliver Cromwell. Ejected 1662.
He was a Calvinist of great learning, and died 1705.
The above work was republ., *Lond.*, 1681, 8vo, and in author's collected Works, *Lond.*, 1822, 8 vols, 8vo. See too Middleton's Biog. Evang., iv., 126; Orme, 251.
In the author's well-known "Living Temple," of which there are many eds. a recent one, *Lond.*, 1830, 12mo, he treats of original sin

——— **Owen** (John) The Ark of the Covenant opened; or, a Treatise of the Covenant of Redemption. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Witsius** (Herm.) De Œconomia Fœderum Dei cum hominibus, lib. iv. 4to. *Leovardiæ.*
Other eds., 1685, 1694, 1712, and 1739. In English, *Lond.*, 1763, 3 vols, 8vo; 1775, 3 vols, 8vo; a New Trans., *Edinb.*, 1771, 3 vols, 8vo; *Edinb.*, 1803, 2 vols, 8vo; *Lond.*, 1822, 2 vols, 8vo. See 1685.

——— Bibliotheca Maxima Veterum Patrum et antiquorum scriptorum ecclesiasticorum primo quidem à M. de la Bigne in lucem edita, &c. 27 vols, fol. *Lugd.*
Contains vol 5:—Prudentius Aurelius—De origine peccatorum. Vol 15:—Prudentius, De prædestinatione, contra Joannem Scotum Erigenam.—Florus,—Sermo de Prædestinatione,—Ratramus—De Prædestinatione Dei. Vol 16:—Theodorus Abucara—De auctore boni et mali. Vol 20:—Honorius Augustodunensis—Inevitabile, sive de Prædestinatione, &c. See 1552. Vol 21:—Odo Tornacensis—De peccato originali—Drogo—De creatione et redemptione primi hominis.

[1677.] **Grebnitz** (Elias) Tractatus Theologicus de Gratiæ Divinæ universalis negatione. 4to. *March.*

1677. **Elis** (Edmund) Omnes qui audiunt Evangelium idque verum agnoscunt, sunt gratiæ et salutis capaces. Cui accesserunt animadversiones in aliqua Jansenii, atque etiam Calvini dogmata veritati prædictæ adversa. Per Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ Presbyterium.
pp. 47, 8vo. *Lond.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Reiserus** (Ant.) Augustinus contra Bellarminum et alios scriptores Papæos, insertis etiam suo loco quæstionibus Jansenio-Norisianis vindicatus. *Francof.*

——— **Tricassinius** (Car. Jos.) Tractatus de natura peccati originalis secundum mentem Augustini. 4to. *Par.*

——— The Sovereignty of the Grace of God, in the Beginning, Progress, and Perfection of Salvation in us: a Serm.
8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Leydecker** (Melch.) Fax veritatis; sive exercitationes de controversiis Belgicis, cum præfatione de statu ecclesiæ Belgicæ et providentia Dei.
4to. *Lug. Bat.*
The author was a learned Dutch divine, Prof. of Divinity at Utrecht, d. 1721.

——— **Meyer** (Jac.) Trost. Quelle der Gnaden-Wahl. 8vo. *Bas.*

——— **Episcopius** (Sim.) Examen Sententiæ Joh. Cameronis de Gratia Dei et Libero Hominis Arbitrio, &c, Ext. in Op. fol. *Amst.*

——— **Fabritius** (Joh.) Von der Gnadenwahl über das IX capittel Epistel Rom. 12mo. *Lemgow.*

——— **Foy** (Flore de S.) Le Miroir de la Pieté chrétienne, ou l'on considère avec des refléxions Morales l'enchainement des verités catholiques de la Prædestination, &c. 12mo. *Liege.*
A Roman Catholic.
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Rust** (George, *D.D.*) The Discourse of Truth. 12mo.
The argument of this discourse is directed against the doctrine of arbitrary decrees. Truth, he asserts, is founded, not in the absolute will of God, but in the eternal and immutable relations of things, the independency of which upon God's mere will he asserts to be necessary to the universal rectitude of the Divine nature. Hence, he argues, subjective truth, both in the creator and the creature, is a representation or conception in the mind, conformable to the unchangeable natures and mutual relations of things.
The author was Bishop of Dromore, and died 1670.

1678. **Troughton** (John) A Letter to a Friend touching God's providence about sinful actions.
pp. 80, 8vo. *Lond.*
This letter is a reply to "The reconcileableness of God's prescience," &c., to the postscript of that letter, see 1677.

1678. **Collinges** (John, *D.D.*) Discourses concerning the actual Providence of God. 4to. *Lond.*
"Scriptural and spiritual."—*Bickersteth.*
"What Collinges has written on Providence is well performed."—*Cotton Mather.*

——— **Parker** (Sam., *D.D.*, *Episc. Oxon.*) Disputationes de Deo et de Providentia Divina contra Scepticos.
pp. 572, 4to. *Lond.*
Another ed., *Oxon.*, 1704, 4to.
"Opus eximium."—*Walch.*
"In scriptoribus his principem locum obtinüit Exhibet solidam confutationem Epicuri, Aristotelis, Hobbesii, Cartesii, scepticorum."—*Walch.*

——— **Gibson** (Will.) Election and Reprobation Scripturally and experimentally witnessed unto. 4to.

——— **[Alsop** (Vincent)] Melius Inquirendum, wherein the cavils against Nonconformists are repelled, and St. Augustine, the Synod of Dort, and the Ch. of Engl. on the Five Points vindicated.
8vo.
Another ed., *Lond.*, 1681, 8vo.
The author was a Nonconformist, ejected in 1662. He d. 1703.
Not attributed to him in Brit. Mus. cat.

——— Entwerffung des unschätzbaren Werths der Göttlichen Gnade.
12mo. *Schweidnitz.*

——— **Strong** (Will.) Discourse on the Two Covenants of Works and Grace.
fol. *Lond.*
A rare and valuable work.
In his 31 select Sermons, *Lond.*, 1656, 4to, p. 267, there is one on "The doctrine of the Jew's vocation."

——— **Cudworth** (Ralph, *D.D.*) The True Intellectual System of the Universe. pp. 999. fol.
The *Imprimatur* at the end of Preface, bears date May 29, 1671. Various ed., abridg. of first ed., by Thos. Wise, 1701, 2 vols, 4to; 1732, 2 vols, sm. 4to. In Latin, by Mosheim, *Jenæ*, 1733, 2 vols, fol.; *Lugd. Bat.*, 1773, 2 vols, 4to; *Lond.*, 1845, with Mosheim's notes, &c., by Harrison, 3 vols, demy 8vo; by Buch, *Lond.*, 1743, 2 vols, 4to. This celebrated work as the author tells us in his preface was intended only as a discourse concerning Liberty and Necessity, or to guard against the fatal necessity of all actions and events. It developed into one of the vastest magazines of reasoning and learning that ever appeared against atheism. It is an imperishable book, but unfortunately unsound on the Trinity. In philosophy Cudworth followed Plato, and the latter Platonists. See Orme, 131. The author d. 1688.

——— **Sanderson** (Robt., *Bp. of Linc.*) The Life of, by Isaac Walton, with some short tracts. 8vo. *Lond.*
P. 47, Pax ecclesiæ [on the decrees of God.]

——— **Greenius** (Geo.) Disputatio de hæresi veterum Prædestinatianorum.
4to. *Vitemb.*

——— **Heidanus** (Abr.) Indicium de universa hodiernorum Pelagianorum hoc est Remonstrantium doctrina.
4to. *Amst.*
See 1641; also author of "Corp. Theol. Christ, see vol 2. (*Grace.*)

1678. **D.** (T.) De Causa Dei, or a vindication of the common doctrine concerning Predetermination, &c.
pp. 123. 8vo. *Lond.*
This is a rare work against John Howe's letter and Postscript "Of God's Prescience." "Remarks" on this tract by A. Marvell. 1678, 8vo. See Theological Tracts, vol 3, 1853.

——— **Froysel** (Thos.) Sermons concerning Grace and Temptations. 4to.
Troysel was a divine of extraordinary worth and moderation. See Palmer's Nonconf., vol ii. He was a native of Shropshire.

——— **Bartholdus** (Gotfr.) *Resp.* De Peccato Originali. *Præs.* Abr. Calovius. 4to. *Witteb.*

——— **Cobabus** (Mich.) *Resp.* Joach. Eggerto, de Prædestinatione.
4to. *Rostoch.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.
Also "Resp. Joach. Eggerti, De concupiscentia originali," *Rostoch.*, 1678, 4to.

——— [**Beverland** (Hadrian)] Peccatum originale.....κατ' ἐξοχὴν sic nuncupatum, philologice προβληματικῶς elucubratum à Themidis Alumno.
pp. 146. 12mo. *Eleutheropoli.* [*Lond?*]
Very rare, see Vogt's Cat. Libr. Rar.
This 1st ed. not in the Brit. Mus., was without author's name, the 2nd ed. in 1679, 12mo, pp. 157 (which is also rare) bore this. It is an anti-Christian treatise. A French transl., 1714, 8vo, 1731, 1740, 12mo, *S.L.* Beverland maintains in the above work that Adam's sin consisted in his commerce with his wife, and that original sin is nothing else but the inclination of the sexes to each other. The book was condemned to be burnt. The author is said to have led a scandalous life, but apparently repented finally, publishing towards the end of his life, "De Fornicatione cavenda,' 1698, pp. 106, 12mo. He is said to have died insane.

——— Réfutation des erreurs contenues dans le livre intit. Le miroir de la pieté chrestienne au sujet de la prédestination et de la grace. *Douay.*

——— **Boudon** (Gr.) La conduite de la divine providence. 12mo. *Paris.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.
Another ed., *Paris*, 1681, 12mo. The author was Archbp. of Evreux.

——— **Junius** (And.) De Providentia et Prædestinatione Meditationes Scholasticæ. pp. 548, fol. *Lugd.*
The author was a Scotch Jesuit, b. 1619, and d. at Madrid, in 1679. He was Prof. of Theol. at Toledo, see 1621. His real name was Andrew Young.

——— **Hurst** (Hen.) Revival of Grace.
8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Cyprianus** (Jo.) De vocatione hominum universali. 4to. *Lips.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Le Febvre** (Hyac. le) Traité de la prédestination. 2 vols. 4to. *Paris.*

——— **Brais** (Steph. de) Exercitationes inaugurales tres.....secunda, de auxiliis, tertia, de pœna peccati.
8vo. *Salm.*
The author was a learned French Protestant minister, Prof. of Theol. at Saumur.
Not in the Brit. Mus.

1678. **Quenstedt** (J. A.) De Redemptione generis humani. 4to. *Vitemb.*

——— **Flavel** (John) A Treatise of the Divine Conduct, or the Mystery of Providence. 8vo. *Lond.*
Other ed., 1691, 12mo; *Bolton*, 1788, 8vo; *Berwick*, 1791, 8vo; 1814, 8vo; 1818, pp. 299, 12mo. The author was an eminent Nonconformist Calvinistic divine, Rector of Diptford, Devon, about 1650, and Dartmouth, 1656; ejected for Nonconformity, 1662, d. 1691.

——— **Martinez** (Nic.) Deus sciens, seu de scientia Dei controversiæ IV. Scholast. 4to. *Monachii.*
Rare.
See De Backer ii, col. 116, No. 2.
The author was a Jesuit.

1679. **Andreæ** (Sam.) De Absoluto Decreto liber. 4to. *Marp.*
Other ed., *Marp.*, 1681, 4to. Reprinted "*cum vindiciis*," 1689, 4to.
The above work is not in the Brit. Mus.

——— Apologie pour le Synode de Dordrecht. 8vo. *Genev.*

——— A Discourse of Divine Assistance and the Method thereof. 12mo. *Lond.*

——— **Pindar** (Wm.) Of Divine Providence in the especial Preservation of Government and Kingdoms, a Sermon.
4to.

——— **Allen** (Will.) Discourse of divine assistance. 8vo. *Lond.*
Another ed., *Lond.*, 1793, 8vo.
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Augustin** (St.) Opera.
11 vols in 15, fol. *Par.*
Vol 7, De Civitate Dei, see 1467.
Vol 10, part 1, Opuscula polemica contra Pelagianos, [see 1538.]
Vol 10, part 2, Contra Julianum; appendix opuscula quædam subdititia; Scripta ad Pelagianam historiam pertinentia; Prosperi Aquitani apologetica pro Augustino. See 1528.

——— **Gennarus** (Theod.) Tractatus de septem peccatis capitalibus, cui accedit quæstio unica de peccato originali.
4to. *Patav.*

——— **Pallavicino** (Nicolas Marii) Difesa della Providenza Divina contro i nemici di ogni religione. *Romæ.*

——— **Grotius** (Hugo) Opera Theolog.
Amst.
Vol 3 (Pred. and Grace.)
Another ed., *Basil.*, 1732.

——— **Leydecker** (Melch.) Vis veritatis, sive disquisitionum ad nonnullas controversias, quæ hodie in Belgio potissimum moventur, de œconomia fœderum Dei. 4to. *Ultraj.*

1679. **Everard** (Dr. John) Gospel treasury opened, discovering the Riches of Grace and glory to the vessels of Mercy. 8vo.
Scarce.
The author was a Mystic and High Calvinist.

——— **Turretinus** (Franc.) Institutio Theologiæ Elenticæ.
3 vols, 4to. *Genev.*
Contains—De decretis Dei in genere et de Prædestinatione in specie—De Providentia Dei—De statu hominis ante lapsum et fœdere naturæ—De peccato—De libero arbitrio. Other ed., *Genev.*, 1682, 3 vols, 4to; 1688, 4 vols, 4to; *Amst.*, 1695, 3 vols, 4to; *Lug. Bat.*, 1696, 3 vols, 4to; *Traj. ad Rhen.*, 1701, 3 vols, 4to; 1734, 3 vols, 4to.
"A very valuable discussion of the most important questions in Theology."—*Bickersteth.*

1680. **Malebranche** (Nicol.) Traité de la Nature et Grace, etc. 12mo. *Rotterd.*
Other ed., *Rotterd.*, 1684, and 1701, 12mo. Translated into English, 1693, cr. 8vo, *Oxf.*, 1694, fol.; *Lond.*, 1695, 8vo; *Rotterd.*, 1712, 8vo. The author was one of the Fathers of the Oratoire, a profound genius and indisputably the greatest metaphysician that France has produced. His works caused much discussion.

——— **Du Moulin** (L.) Moral Reflexions upon the number of the Elect, plainly proving from Scripture evidence, etc., that not one in 100,000, nay, probably not one in a million, from Adam down to our Times shall be saved.
4to. *Lond.*
There was an earlier edition the same year in French. The author was an able Calvinistic writer, for some time Camden Prof. of History at Oxford. "A fiery, violent, and hot-headed independent, a cross and ill natured man.—*Wood's Athen. Oxon.*

——— **Ryssenius** (Leon.) Justa Detestatio Libelli sceleratissimi Hadr. Beverlandi de Peccato originali.
8vo. *Gorinchemii.*

——— **Quantin** (Geo.) La theologie Françoise. 8vo. *Paris.*
Grace.

——— **Lobb** (Stephen) The Glory of Free Grace displayed. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Shelton** (William) Divine Providence the support of Good Men under all events, on Ps. xcvii, 1. 4to.

——— **Outram** (William, *D.D.*) Sermons. 8vo. *Lond.*
One on Divine Providence.
The author was Archdeacon of Leicester, 1669; Preb. of Westminster, 1670, and Rector of St. Margaret's, Westminster. He was a nervous and accurate writer, and an excellent oriental scholar, best known for his work "Of Sacrifices," d. 1679, aged 54.

——— **Jurien** (Pierre) Histoire du Calvinisme et celle du Papisme mise en parallèle; ou apologie pour les Reformateurs, pour la Reformation, et pour les Reformés contre l'Histoire du Calvinisme par Maimbourg.
4to. *Rotterdam.*
The work of Maimbourg seems to have appeared before 1680, and a reply to it in 1680.
Another work with same title, but without author's name, appeared at *Rotterd.*, 1683, 4to, 2 vols, or 4 vols in 12mo.

1680. **Schmidt** (Jo. Andreas) De Termino Vitæ, an possit produci, an abbreviari? 4to. *Jenæ.*
The author was Doctor of Theology, and Prof. at the Univ. of Jena.
For another work of his see Arpe 100.

——— **Charnock** (Stephen) On Divine Providence. *Lond.*
Reprinted in Ward's Library of Standard Theology, see 1682.
A Germ. trans., *Berol.*, 1716, 8vo. Another ed. (by R. Adams) *Lond.*, 1808, and 1830, 8vo, *Lond.*, [1840], 8vo.

——— **Bechmannus** (Frid.) Disp. de Prædestinatione. 4to. *Jenæ.*

——— **Kortholt** (Christ.) Resp. Mart. Laurentio, de Prædestinatione.
4to. *Kilon.*

——— **Schuder** (Chr. G.) De Deo ad omnes hominis etiam malas seu vitiosas actiones, sine vitio concurrente.
4to. *Jenæ.*

——— **Gennarus** (Theod.) Manuale Confessorum in quo de Natura, divisione, causis et effectibus peccati, etc.
4to. *Patav.*

1681. De la Prédestination et de la Grace, Poëme Chrétien. *Amst.*

——— **Comitibus** (Petrus de) Tractatus de Prædestinatione et Reprobatione, etc. pp. 718. 12mo. *Venetiis.*
Very rare.
Also author of "Tract. de Intellectu, et Scientia Dei," *Patavii*, 1684, 12mo.

——— **Burnet** (Thos.) Telluris theoria sacra. 4to. *Lond.*
This original ed. is rare.
De diluvio et Paradiso, pp. 306, was pub. in 1681, and De conflagratione Mundi et de futuro rerum statu, pp. 262, not till 1689. Other ed., *Francof.*, 1691, 12mo; *Amst.*, 1699, 4to; *Lond.*, 1702, 4to. In Eng., the first 2 books, 1684, fol; 1689, last 2 books, *Lond.*, 1690, fol.; *Lond.*, 1691, fol.; 1697, fol.; 1719, 2 vols, 8vo; 1722, 8vo; 1726, 2 vols; 7th ed., *Lond.*, 1759, 2 vols, 8vo; 1816, 4to; 1826, 4to; *Glasg.*, 1753, 2 vols, 12mo. In German, *Hamburg*, 1703, 4to. The English version is by no means an exact transcript of the original; there are additions, abridgments & alterations. The author was Master of the Charterhouse in 1685, and his work (which contains a dissertation on natural providence), met with marked attention from Chas. II. and his Court. See *Biog. Brit.*; *Spectator*, No. 146. Burnet's book was attacked as unphilosophical by Erasmus Warren in his Geologia, *Lond.*, 1690, to which Burnet replied in "An answer to the Exceptions made by Mr. E. Warren," &c., *Lond.*, 1690, fol. Warren rejoined and Burnet replied in "A Short Consideration, &c." The above book was also attacked by Keil in "An examination," *Lond.*, 1698, 8vo; 1734, 8vo, to which Burnet replied in his "Reflexions." Some animadversions were also pub. upon the *Theory* by Herbert (Crofts) Bp. of Hereford, *Lond.*, 1685, 8vo; by John Beaumont, *Lond.*, 1693, 4to; 1694, 4to; A. Lovell, 1696, 4to;

Robert St. Clair, *Lond.*, 1697, 12mo. Flamstead, the King's astronomer, declared that he was able to overthrow Dr. Burnet's theory in one sheet of paper. Burnet's system was ingenious, and his book was written in an animated and eloquent style. A short abstract of it will be found in the 7th vol of Dr. Tower's Brit. Biog., pp. 73—77. Addison alludes to the above theory of the earth, and thus addresses him :—

O pectus ingens ! O animum gravem,
Mundi capacem ! Si bonus anguior,
Te, nostra quo tellus superbit,
Accipiet renovata civem.

1681. **Wercamp** (Philippus Dietericus) *Resp.* Dissertatio philotheosophica de Libertate Dei. *Præs.* J. Kohler. 4to. *Rinthelii.*

——— **Nadasi** (Joan.) Vita et mores Prædestinatorum ; seu Signa XXXIV Prædestinationis quæ omnibus salutis Æternæ. pp. 974, fol. *Viennæ.*

Other ed., *Ungarus*, 1715, fol.; *Colon.*, 1726, fol.; *Vien.*, 1744.

The author was a Jesuit; see De Backer, vii, 314.

——— **Recupito** (G. C.) Tractatus duo de Signis Prædestinationis et Reprobationis et de numero prædestinatorum ac reproborum. 4to. *Lugd.*

See also 1643.

——— **Wagenseilius** (Jo. Christ.) Tela Ignea Satanæ, etc. 4to. *Altdorfi Noricorum.*

This is a collection and confutation of the most violent of the Rabbinical writings against Christianity, and is a scarce and curious work. The author was Prof. of the Oriental languages at Altorf, b. 1633, d. 1706.

——— **Flavel** (John) The method of Grace in bringing home eternal Redemption. 4to. *Lond.*

Another ed., 1698, 4to ; 1699, sm. 4to. Also author of "The Touchstone of Sincerity, or the Sign of Grace," &c., 1698, 12mo.

——— **Tricassinius** (Car. Jos.) Commentarius in libros D. Augustini contra Pelagianos, Adrumetinos, et præcipue in libros de prædestinatione, libero arbitrio, et gratia. 4to. *Paris.*

——— **Meisnerus** (Jo.) De Prædestinatione Filiorum Dei ad vitam æternam. 4to. *Vitemb.*

——— **Schubartus** (A.) De Prædestinatione Filiorum Dei ad vitam æternam. 4to. *Vitemb.*

——— **Fleming** (Robt.) The fulfilment of the Scriptures held forth in a discovery of the exact accomplishment of the word of God in his works of Providence. 2 vols, 12mo. *Lond.*

Many ed., 5th and best by Daniel Burgess, 1726, fol. The author was minister at Cambuslang, Clydesdale, and being in 1662 ejected, took charge of a Scotch congregation at Rotterdam, where he died 1694 ; see Middleton's *Biog. Evang.* iv., 69. The above work relates many particular providences which had attended the author's life.

1681. **Horneck** (Ant., *D.D.*) God's Providence in the midst of confusion. 4to.

The author was Vicar of All Saint's, Oxf., 1633 ; Preb. of Exeter, and subsequently of Westminster and Wells ; Preacher in the Savoy, 1671.

——— **Schweitzer** (Jo.) De Essentia Prædestinationis, de Pœna Damnatorum et de Purgatorio. 8vo. *Colon.*

Also author of "Dissertatio triplex Theologica ad mentem J. P. August. I. de primorum hominum creatione, et innocentiæ statu," &c., *Col.*, 1682, 8vo,

——— **Thomassin** (Louis) Mémoires sur la grace. 3 vols, 12mo. *Paris.*

Best ed., *Par* , 1682, 4to. "Congr. Orat. Dogmata theologica," 4 vols, *Venet.*, 1730, fol., contains—Compend. controversiarum de gratia; see Hurter ii, p. 385.

——— **Quenstedt** (Jo.) Disputatio de actu speciali Providentiæ Divinæ circa Justum, et custodiendis ejus ossibus, ex Psal. XXXIV., 21. 4to. *Vitemb.*

——— **Spinula** (Steph.) Scholastica theologia. fol. *Papiæ.*

Part I—De Scientia, de Voluntate, de Prædestinatione, &c.

——— **Lane** (Edward) Du Moulin's reflections reverberated, being a full answer to a pernicious pamphlet intituled moral reflections on the number of the Elect. 4to.

——— **Vincent** (Nathl.) True Touchstone, which shows both Grace and Nature. sm. 8vo.

1682. **Velten** (Valent.) *Resp.* Lohrmann De Absoluto Decreto. 4to. *Jenæ.*

——— **Cocq** (Herm.) *Resp.* De Providentia Dei. 4to.

——— **Whiston** (Joseph) A Brief discourse concerning Man's natural proneness to.....error. Whereunto is added some arguments to prove that that covenant entred with Abraham.....is the covenant of grace. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Irenæus** (Paul) [Nicole (Pet.)] Causa Janseniana. 8vo. *Colon.*

——— **Neville** (Rob.) The Absolute Decree of Election to eternal glory reprobated : a Serm. on Ephes. i, 4. 4to. *Lond.*

The author was Rector of Ansty.

——— **Lemos** (Tho. de) Memoriale cum Vindiciis librorum Panopliæ Gratiæ. *Aug. Vind.*

——— **Kromayer** (Hier.) Loci antisyncretistici. 4to. *Lipsiæ.*

2nd ed. *Lips.*, 1683, 4to.

——— **Maimbourg**, Hist. du Calvinisme. 8vo. *Par.*

Other eds., *Par.*, 1682, 12mo, p. 514 ; 3rd ed., *Par.*, 1682, 12mo, 2 vols; *Par.*, 1686, 4to ; *Brux.*, 1686, 12mo, 2 vols. Several replies to this, one *Rotterd.*, 1684, 4to, 2 vols. Reprinted 2 vols, 12mo, 1683 ; and 1686, 4to .

1682. **Porcq** (Jean le) Les Sentimens de S. Augustin sur la Grace opposés à ceux de Jansenius. 4to. *Paris.*

Another ed., *Lyon*, 1700, 4to.

——— **Charnock** (Stephen) Works. 2 vols. fol. *Lond.*

On the Divine Attributes, the providence of God, &c.

"I have not seen any author who has exceeded, probably no one who has equalled Charnock on the Existence and Attributes of God."—*Griffith Williams.*

"The best practical treatise the world ever saw in English upon the subject."—*Harvey.*

This is certainly a work of great merit. The author was one of the most eminent of the Nonconformists, and his works embrace elaborate discourses on the existence and attributes of God, on divine providence and other important subjects. He was a deep divine rather than an eloquent writer. Dr. Doddridge truly remarks, "His thoughts are often in disorder; he has no clear and distinct idea on many of the differences he makes."

Another ed., *Lond.*, 1699, 2 vols, fol, 1861, 8vo. Various ed. of Attributes, *Lond.*, 1797, 8vo; 1835, 8vo; 1842, 8vo; 1845, 8vo; [1863], 8vo; 1855, 8vo. The best edition appeared at Leeds in 9 vols, 8vo, in 1815. See Orme, 98.

——— **Bayle** (Pierre) Remarques sur l'Histoire du Calvinisme de M. Maimbourg. 12mo. *Hay. Com.*

——— ——— Critique generaî de l'Histoire du Calvinisme du P. Maimbourg. 2 vols, 12mo. *Vill. Franc.*

Reprinted with additions in 1682 and in 1683 in 2 vols, 12mo; 1684, 4 vols; *Amst.*, 1714, 12mo. Bayle was a celebrated critic, an able but dangerous writer. As Orme justly remarks, "religious indifference rather than religious liberty properly so called was the object of Bayle's devotion."

——— **Schomerus** (J. C.) Resp. Glers., de Semiprædestinatione Latitudinaria. 4to. *Rost.*

——— **Duckerus** (Joan. Gul.) *Resp.* De Providentia Dei. 4to.

——— **Dörffel** (Geo. Sam.) Seelen-Gift des Trostlosen Pabstthums wider die Zweiffels Lehre Aloisii Richardi. 12mo. *Jenæ.*

——— **Weis** (Godf.) Sententia Alberti de notitia Status integri naturali homini non competere. 4to. *Rost.*

——— **Elers** (A.) De Semi-prædestinatione latitudinaria. 4to. *Rostoch.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Jurien** (Pierre) Traité de la Devotion avec deux sermons sur la Perseverance. 8vo. *Rotteerd.*

——— **Gale** (Theophilus) The Court of the Gentiles. 4to. *Lond.*

Vol. 5, pt. 2, "Of Divine predetermination, wherein the nature of divine predetermination is fully explicated and demonstrated, both in the general, as also more particularly as to the substrata matter, or entitative act of sin, with a vindication of Calvinists and others from their blasphemous imputation of making God the author of sin." This portion of the work is rare, and is frequently wanting. The 1st ed. of the 5 parts was published 1669—77. The work occupied the author 20 years, see *Athen. Oxon.* The leading object of this work is to trace all human learning, philosophy and religion to the Ancient scriptures and the Jewish people. It is a learned and curious work. Gale was a presbyterian minister, b. 1628, d. 1677.

1682. [**Rous** (Jean)] Remarques sur l'histoire du Calvinisme de M. du Maimbourg. 12mo. *La Hage.*

[1682.] **Renteria** (Martin) MS. De divina Providentia et Prædestinatione.

The author was a Jesuit, and d. 1682. The above MS. is preserved in the Library of the College of Santos in Mexico.

1682. De Sententia facultatis Theologicæ Lovaniensis in materia prædestinationis et gratiæ. fol.

——— The Covenant of Grace effectually remembered, the substance of a Sermon. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Wittichius** (Christ.) Exercitationes theologicæ quinque. 4to. *Lug. Bat.*

3rd, fides sanctorum perseverans et certa. "Ubi," says Walch, Bibl. Theol. i, 250, "providentiam Dei ac singulos ejus actus explicat eamdemque cum hominis libertate conjungit." The above work is not in the Brit. Mus.

1683. **Heigelius** (Paul) Disputat. de Gratiæ Divinæ sufficientia et Abundantia. 4to. *Helmst.*

——— [**Rocolles** (J. B. de)] Histoire véritable du Calvinisme. 12mo. *Amst.*

——— Apologie de la réformation contre un libelle intitulé: Histoire du Calvinisme. 12mo. 3 vols. *Amst.*

——— **Goodman** (John, *D.D.*) The interests of Divine Providence in the Government of the World. A sermon. 4to. *Lond.*

The author was Rector of Hadham, Herts., and Archdeacon of Middlesex.

——— **Fecht** (Joh.) Consideratio Status Damnatorum, quod Actiones ipsorum, imprimis malas, concernit. 4to. *Spiræ.*

Other ed., *Rostochii*, 1707, 1708, 1727, 8vo. See Acta. Erud., 1685, pp. 179—183.

——— **Le Blanc** (Lewis) Theses theologicæ, variis temporibus in Academia Sedanensi editæ et ad disputandum propositæ. fol. *Lond.*

De Prædestinatione, peccato, libero arbitrio, gratia, necessitate, &c.

——— Theses theologicæ de doctrina S. Augustini circa prædestinationem et gratiam Christi. 4to. *Lovanii.*

1683. **Vos** (Phillippe de) Theses Theologicæ pro auctoritate Innocentii X. et Alexandri VII. condemnantium 5 propositiones Cornelii Jansenii, etc., Præside R. P. Philippo de Vos, S.J. Def. P. Antonio De Roose, S.J. . 4to. *Lovanii.*

——Theses historico-theologicæ de doctrina Semi-pelagianorum circa prædestinationem et gratiam Christi. 4to. *Lovanii.*

Other Theses concerning Grace, at the same place, same year.

—— **Franckius** (Chr.) De libero arbitrio. *Kilon.*

——**Schmutz** (A.) Divinæ providentiæ extraordinem mira, etc. 4to. *Argent.*

—— **Corbet** (John) A humble endeavour of some plain and brief explication of the decrees and operations of God about the Free Actions of men; more especially of the operations of grace. 4to. *Lond.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

—— **Bijonius** (Gervasius) De gratiæ auxiliis. fol. *Lugd.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

—— **Müllerus** (Phil.) Dubitatio Pontificia de Justific. et gratia Dei. 4to. *Jenæ.*

—— **Turner** (John) The middle way betwixt Necessity and Freedom. Two sermons. 8vo. *Lond.*

A second part, *Lond.*, 1684, 8vo.

The author was Vicar of Greenwich. He was the Boyle Lecturer for 1708, taking as his subject, "The wisdom of God in the redemption of man," *Lond.*, 1709, 8vo.

—— **[Jurien** (Pierre)] Histoire de Calvinisme et celle du Papisme mises en parallèle. 4 vols. 4to. *Rotterd.*

—— [——] Histoire véritable du Calvinisme. 12mo. *Amst.*

Jurien was a learned Huguenot, who is called by Roman Catholics, "the Goliath of the Protestants."

—— **Norris** (John) Tractatus adversus Reprobationis absolutæ Decretum, &c. 8vo. *Lond.*

The author was a minute mystic divine, a disciple of Malabranche. In the above tract the Calvinistic dissenters are ably attacked. He was for some years Rector of Bemerton, near Salisbury. He d. 1711.

—— Justificatio, seu Defensio censuræ Facultatis S. Theologiæ Academiæ Lovaniensis contra assertiones quasdam Professorum ibidem. Soc. Nominis Jesu de Scriptura Sacra, Prædestinatione et Gratia Christi. pp. 237. 8vo. *Paris.*

—— **Schmidius** (Joh.) De Fatalitate Temporum. 4to. *Argent.*

1683. **Goodwin** (Thos.) Works. 5 vols. fol. *Lond.*

Vol. 2. A Discourse of Election, of the free and special grace of God manifested therein, the absoluteness of his decrees, and their infallible accomplishment. In vol. 3, pub. in 1692, the author has "Man's restauration by grace." Goodwin's treatises were again pub. 1844, 4 vols, 8vo. He was a rigid Calvinist.

—— **Lütkemann.** De viribus naturalis gratiæ in conversione hominis. 4to. *Witteb.*

—— **Geddes** (Wm.) The Saint's Recreation. 4to. *Edinb.*

The 3rd part upon the estate of grace.

—— **Hartwiss** (Bart. Anhorn ab) Theatri concionum Sacrarum Topici, Theoretici, Practici, Pars V. de Lapsa primorum Parentum, Peccato originali et Libero Arbitrio, &c. 4to. *Basil.*

Extremely rare.

1684. **Camfield** (Benj.) Of God's Almighty Providence both in sending and dissolving great snows and frosts. A Sermon. 4to. *Lond.*

Another ed., *Lond.*, 1740, 8vo.

—— **Marius** (Mercator) Opera. Stephanus Baluzius ad fidem veterum codicum MSS. emendavit, et notis illustravit. 8vo. *Paris.*

Nestorii sermones adversus hæresim Pelagianam.

Another ed., cura J. P. Migne, *Paris*, 1846.

—— **Hobbes** (Thos.) Tripos. 3rd ed. 8vo. *Lond.*

Part 1. Of Liberty and Necessity wherein all controversie concerning Predestination, Election, Freewill, Grace, Merits, and Reprobation, is fully decided and cleared.

See 1654.

—— **Hockin** (Thos.) A Discourse on the Nature of God's Decrees. pp. 390. 8vo. *Lond.*

A marvellously weak and silly book. The author was Fell. of All Souls, and preacher at St. Bartholomew, in London. It is to be hoped that his scholarship was superior to his theology, and his sermons to his above work.

—— **Rapin** (Réne) La vie des predestinez dans la bien heureux éternité. pp. 235. 4to. *Paris.*

Other ed., *Paris*, 1684, 12mo; *Brux.*, 1706, 12mo. Rapin was also author of "Evangelium Jansenistorum," and "Le Pacificateur Apostolique contre les Jansenistes," etc., and "Histoire du Jansénisme," révu et publié par l'Abbé Donnenech [1861] 8vo.

—— **Heideggerus** (Jo. Hen.) Historia Papatus. 4to. *Amst.*

(Calvinistic.)

An ed. in French, *Amst.*, 1685, 2 vols, 12mo; *Amst.*, 1678, 4to.

—— Apologiæ Patrum Societatis, contra censuram Lovaniensem et Duacensem conscriptæ circa an. 1588. pp. 162. 8vo. *Leodii.*

1684. **Mather** (Increase) An essay for the recording of illustrious Providences, especially in New England. 12mo. *Bost., U.S.*

A new ed. under the title of Remarkable Providences illustrative of the earlier days of American Colonization, with Intro. Pref. by Geo. Offer. *Lond*, 1856, 12mo. In this book we have a singular collection of remarkable sea deliverances, accidents, unaccountable phenomena, witchcraft, apparitions, &c.

——— Epistolæ ecclesiasticæ et theologicæ præstantium ac eruditorum virorum. 2nd ed. fol. *Amst.*

A collection of 945 letters mostly by Arminius, Uytenbogardus, Vorstius, Vossius, Grotius and Episcopius, and they are very valuable as illustrating the history of Arminianism. The 1st ed. was 1660, which see. The 2nd and 3rd contain the correspondence of the Brownists, &c. 3rd ed., *Amst.*, 1704, fol.

——— **Cene** (Chas. le) De l'estat de l'homme après le pèche, et de sa prédestination au salut. 12mo. *Amstel.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

The author was a French Protestant minister, b. 1646, d. 1703.

——— **Requeseus** (Joseph Marie de) Opuscula Theologica. 4to. pp. 478. *Romæ.*

This is the 2nd ed., but 1st contains a work "De Prædestinatione, seu electione hominum ad gloriam."

——— Tractatus de intellectu et Scientia Dei. 8vo. *Patavii.*

[1684.] **Drattenberger** (Matthew) Disputatio Theologica de Gratia Dei supernaturali, Præside P. Drattenberger, S.J. 8vo. pp. 148. *Dilingæ.*

Drattenberger also presided at Disputations on "De peccatis et Dei concursu," in 1683, *Dilingæ.*, 8vo, pp. 156, and "De Scientia Dei," in 1688, *Dilingæ*, 8vo, pp. 116.

Some of the above works are in the Brit. Mus.

——— Thesis historico-theologica Lovaniensium cum Thomistis concordiam circa necessitatem gratiæ per se efficacis in statu naturæ lapsu inculente demonstrans. 4to. *Lovanii.*

——— **Schmidius** (Jo.) De peccato originali, gentibus ignorato. *Lips.*

——— **Clericus** (Jo.) Explication des chapitres ix., x., xi., de l'epitre de Saint Paul aux Romains. 12mo. *Amst.*

——— **Gerberon** (Gabr.) La verité catholique victorieuse.

Concerning Predestination, and efficacious grace, against Hazart, the Jesuit.

——— **Gottlieb** (John.) De Nuditate hominum in statu post lapsum disputatio: præside J. G. 4to. *Lips.*

——— The Confession of faith of those called Arminians. Transl. into English. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— Decretum ordinum Hollandiæ et Westfrisiæ contra libellum Sibrandi Lubberti inscriptum, *Responsio*, ad pietatem Hug. Grotii. 4to. *Lug. Bat.*

1685. **Baronius** (Rob.) Metaphysica Generalis. 12mo. *Cantab.*

P. 49, De Natura Mali, p. 133, De concursu Dei; p. 237, De Peccato Origin.; p. 291, De Necessario et Contingenti; p. 299, De libertate arbitrii in homine; p. 340, De Præscientia et Providentia Dei, deque earum concordia cum contingentia rerum et libertate arbitrii humani.

The 1st ed. was *Lond.*, 1660, 12mo.

——— **Vries** (Ger. de) Exercit. rationales de Deo. 4to. *Traj. ad Rhem.*

Providence treated of.

Another ed. same place, 1695, 4to.

He was also Pres. "Determ. philosophicæ de Deo creante et providente," 1686, 4to. *Resp.* Reynolds (Thomas) and *Pres.*, "Determ. philosophicæ de attributis Dei independentis." *Resp.*, Hughes (Georgius), 1696, 4to.

——— **De Dijon** (Nicolas) Pharaon reprouvé; ou l'Avocat de la providence de Dieu en la réprobation des Pécheurs. 4to. *Lyon.*

[1685.] **Boedick** (Christ.) Dissertationem de attributis Dei ex lumine Naturæ cognoscibilibus.....proponit C. B. 4to. [*Leipsic.*]

1685. **Witsius** (Herm., *D.D.*) De Œconomia Fœderum Dei cum hominibus, lib. iv. 4to. *Leovard.*

This is the 2nd ed.

The 1st was *Leovardiæ*, 1677, pp. 700, 4to, which see.

The 3rd ed., *Trajecti ad Rhenum*, 1694, 4to.

Another ed., *Basileæ*, 1739, 4to. In English, *Edinb.*, 1771, 3 vols, 8vo; and 1803, 2 vols, 8vo, by W. Crookshank, *Lond.*, 1822, 2 vols, 8vo.

The author was a Dutchman, and Prof. of Theology in the Univ. of Franeker, 1673, and Divinity Prof. of Utrecht in 1680, and at Leyden, 1698. He d. 1708. See Middleton's Biog. Evang., iv. 156.

——— Cases resolved: Whether a certainty of being in a state of salvation be attainable. 4to.

——— **Quenstedt** (Jo. Andr.) Theologia Didactico-polemica. fol. *Vitemb.*

Part iii. *Predestination*, Part i. civ. and Part iv. cvii, *Grace*. Other ed., 1696, 1702, 1715 all in fol. "Opus est Magni laboris, nec mediocris eruditionis." See Walch, Bibl. Theol. i. 58 and 70.

——— [**Bayle** (P.) Nouvelles Lettres de l'Auteur de la Critique genérale de l'histoire du Calvinisme de Maimbourg. 2 vols. 12mo. *Vill. Franc.*

Another ed., *Amst.*, 1715, 2 vols, 12mo.

——— **Serre** (Ant.) Le Plan de l'héresie de Calvin divisé, en VII. Tables. fol. *Paris.*

Treats of Predestination and Reprobation.

——— **Espersa Artieda** (Martin de) M. S. Tractatus de Gratia efficaci et prædestinatione. pp. 269. 4to.

Delandine, MSS. de la Bibl. de Lyon, see De Backer, vol. 1. p. 288.

——— **A[rnauld]** (Antoine)] Reflexions philosophiques et théologiques sur le nouveau système de la nature et de la grace [of N. Malebranche], &c. 12mo.

——— **Bernier** (François) Traité de la Liberté et de la Volonté. 12mo. *Amst.*

1685. **Malebranche** (Nicol.) Response à une dissertation de M. Arnauld contre un Ecclaircissement du Traité de la Nature et de la Grace. 12mo. *Rotterd.*

The dissertation of Arnauld was published the same year, *Cologne*, 12mo. Another Response to Arnauld by Malebranche, *Rotterd.*, 1686, 12mo, and "Recueil de toutes les réponses du P. Malebranche à M. Arnauld" was publ. *Paris*, 1709, 4 vols, 12mo.

——— **Quistorpius** (Nicol.) An peccatum originale sit mere privatum? *Rost.*

——— **Ehrenberger** (Statius) De seductione Adami, dissertatio philosophico-theologica, &c. 4to. *Helmstadii.*

——— **Clerc** (Dan. le) Entretiens sur diverses matiéres de théologie. 12mo. *Amst.*

Treats of Grace, Freewill, original sin and predestination.

——— **Pitcairn** (Alex.) Harmonia Evangelica apostolorum Pauli et Jacobi in Doctrina de Justificatione, &c. 4to. *Rotterd.*

"In this work, which is of a controversial nature, the author opposes Socinians, Papists, Arminians, in general, and Curcellæus, Morus, Bull, Sherlock, and Baxter in particular. There is a good deal of learning and acuteness displayed in the book, and the doctrinal views of Pitcairn are those which are usually held by Calvinists." —*Orme, Bibl. Bib.*

——— The Useful cases resolved, I. Whether a certainty of being in a state of Salvation be attainable, &c. 4to. *Lond.*

1686. **Souliere**, Histoire du Calvinisme, contenant sa Naissance, son Progres, sa Décadence, et son Fin en France. 4to. *Paris.*

See Walchii, Bibl. Theol. ii., 378, 473, &c.

——— **Boissieu** (Ant.) Le Chrétien prédestiné par la dévotion à Marie. 8vo. *Lyon.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

The author was a Jesuit, who died at Lyons in 1691.

[1686.] **Possinus** (Pierre) MS. Historia Controversiarum. 1000 pp, 4to.

This MS. contains a history of all the controversies which have raged between the Jesuits and Dominicans between 1588 and 1612. See Delandine MSS. de la Bibl. de Lyon.

The writer was a Jesuit who died in 1686.

1686. **Lambe** (John) The Liberty of human nature, discussed, stated, and limited: a Serm. on 1 Cor., vi., 12. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Bruyn** (Isaac de) Theses theologicæ de peccatis, gratia et legibus quas præside R. P. Isaaco de Bruyn. 4to. *Lovanii.*

Bruyn was a Jesuit, Prof. of theology at Louvain.

1685—6. **[Arnauld** (Ant.)] Reflexions sur le nouveau Système de la Nature et Grace contre Nicolas Malebranche. 3 vols, 12mo. *Cologne.*

[1686.] **Gilbert** ( ) Tractatus de Gratiâ.

The author was Professor Royal in Theology in the University of Douay.

Five celebrated Doctors and Professors of the Facaulty of Paris were charged by Lewis XIV to examine this work, and they declared, 28th Jan., 1687, "qu' après une exacte discussion ils avoient reconnu que la Doctrine de Jansenius, condemnée par les constitutions d'Innocent X. et Alexandre VII., recues de tous les Catholiques, y étoit établie, non par d'une manière obscure et en passant, ou en peu de mots, mais ouvertement, de dessein formè, avec un empressement et une obstination extrème, sans y oublier les expressions injurieuses, et pleines d'aigreur, qui ressentent l'esprit des Novateurs: que par des interprétations chimérique on y éludoit les décisions des Souverains Pontifes, en les détournant à un sens étranger et entièrement éloigné de leur pensée. Enfin que ce poison, aussi dangereux qu'il y en puisse avoir pour les Ecoles, étoit tellement répandu dans tous ces Ecrits, qu'il seroit impossible de les corriger: et qu'il n'y avoit pas d'autre moyen de lever le scandale qu'ils avoient causé, que de les abjurer expressement. Ce qui nous a fait juger qu'on ne pouvoit pas souffrir, sans perdre l'Université de Douay, que celui que les a composés continué d'y enseigner."

The author was deprived of his Professorship.

1686. ——— La Phantosme du Jansénisme. 8vo. *Colgne.*

A 2nd ed., *Col.*, 1688, 12mo; 3rd ed., 1714.

The author was either Arnauld or Nicole.

——— **Barovius** (Joannes Georgius) *Resp.* De dispensatione Fœderis Gratiæ, sub Æternitate. *Præs.* P. van Mastricht. 4to. *Ultrajecti.*

——— **[Ville** (Fr. de la)] Préjuges Légitimes contre le Jansénisme. 12mo. *Colon.*

——— **Jurien** (Pierre) Jugement sur les Méthodes rigides et relachées d'expliquer la Providence et la Grace. 12mo. *Rot.*

——— **Limborch** (Phil à) Theologia Christiana ad Praxim Pietatis ac Promotionem Pacis Christianæ unice directa, cum Effigie. 4to. *Amst.*

Lib. iv. and vi. (Pred.), lib. iv. and v. (Grace). Another ed. in 1715.

This was one of the first systems of divinity, according to the Remonstrants. Bp. Warburton observes it is a masterpiece which in its kind may be compared to a work of Raphael's finished by Tullo Romano, and in the opinion of Mr. Charles Butler it is 'one of the most interesting and entertaining works of controversy that has appeared upon any subject.'

The System of Divinity was translated by W. Jones into English in 1702, 2 vols, 8vo, *Lond.*, and reprinted in 1713, 2 vols, 8vo, pp. 1,090, and abridged by John Riles, a Wesleyan, and published at Macclesfield, in 1807, pp. 392, 8vo.

To the Editions, *Amst.*, 1715 and 1730, fol., is added a History of the origin and progress of the controversy in Belgium, respecting predestination. See 1715.

1686. **Piccinardus** (Ser.) Nova quæstio historico-theologica de novitio opere, quod inscribitur: Prædestinatus ete anonymi semi Pelagiani, nuper reperto et impresso in Galliis. 4to. *Patavii.*

——— **Reynolds** (Thomas) Determinationes Philosophicæ de Deo creante et Providente. 4to. *Traj. ad Rhen.*

1687. **Filoramus** (Gabr.) Lapis Lydius circa materiam de præscientia, prædestinatione, et reprobatione, &c. fol. *Messanæ.*

A very rare work.

———[**Quesnel** (Pasq.)] Abregé de l'histoire de la congregation de auxiliis. 12mo. *Francof.*

——— Compendium actorum congregationis de auxiliis à Greg. Nunnio Coronei. 12mo. *Francof.*

——— Lettres du P. Mallebranche touchant celles de M. Arnauld. 12mo. *Rotterd.*

——— **Muniessa** (Thos.) Disputationes Scholasticæ. 4 vols, fol. *Burimone.*

iii.—De Gratia actuali, habituali, Justificatione et merito.

iv.—De Providentia Dei.

The author was a Jesuit, d. 1696.

A rare work.

Another ed., 1694, fol.

———[**Quesnel** (Pasq.)] Tradition de l'Eglise Romaine sur la Prédestination des Saints et sur la Grace efficace, par M. Germain. 3 vols, 12mo. *Cologne.*

Another ed., *Paris*, 12mo. In opposition to Deschamps. See 1688

——— **Beenius** (Joannes) and **Wardbergius** (J. C.) *Resp.* Dissertationum de providentia decima quinta, immortalitatem animorum ex lumine naturæ probans, quam submittit J. N. B. una defendente J. C. W. 4to. *Hafniæ.*

[1687.] **Braemer** (Georgius Christianus) Disputatio theologica brevi tabello complectens doctrinam de libero arbitrio, *Præs.* H. G. Masio. 4to. *Havniæ.*

1687. An occasional discourse concerning God's Fore-knowledge and Man's Free-agency. 12mo. *Lond.*

Another ed., *Lond.*, 1697, 18mo.

——— [**Papin** (Isaac)] Essais de Théologie sur la providence et la Grace immediate, &c. pp. 560, 8vo. *Francf.*

This is mostly a criticism of the doctrine of Jurien.

——— **Alting** (Jas.) Opera Omnia theologica, analytica, exegetica, practica, problematica, et philologica. 5 vols, fol. *Amst.*

Vol. 5, p. 126, De Prædestinatione; p. 139, De pœna peccati parentum in liberis; p. 179, De libero arbitrio.

The author was a learned German divine, Prof. of Hebrew at Groningen, 1667, and died 1679.

He wrote a Grammar for eight of the Oriental languages.

1687. La Confession de foy des Eglises Reformées des Pays-bas, et.....avec le jugement du synode de Dordrecht sur les cinq articles, &c. 4to. *Amst.*

——— **Brancatus** (L. Card.) Opuscula tria de Deo, quoad opera prædestinationis, reprobationis, et gratiæ actualis. 4to. *Romæ.*

Another ed., *Rothomagi*, 1705, 4to.

Neither of these in Brit. Mus., but in "Thesaurus Theologicus," tom. 2, 1762, &c., 4to.

——— **Coronel** (Greg. Num.) Brevis Enarratio actorum omnium quæ circa controversiam de auxiliis divinæ gratiæ sub Clemente Papa VIII., celebrata sunt, &c. 12mo. *Francof.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Spanheim** (Frid.) Controversiarum de religione cum dissidentibus hodie Christianis, et cum Judæis elenchus historico-theologicus. 8vo. *Lug. Bat.*

Other eds., *Amst.*, 1694, 8vo; *Viade.*, 1703, 8vo; *Lug. Bat.*, 1757, 4to.

The work contains a learned account of the controversy between the Calvinists and Arminians.

1688. **Hartnaccus** (Dan.) Breviarium controversiarum theologicarum inter Evangelicos...Arminianos et anabaptistas præcipuarum. 8vo. *Cellis.*

——— [**Gerberon** (Gabr.)] Défense de l' Eglise Romaine contre les calumnées des Protestants. 12mo. *Cologne.*

——— **Burnet** (Gilb., *Bp. of Salisbury*) Three Letters on Molinos and the Quietists, &c. 12mo.

Not apparently in Brit. Mus.

——— **Calovius** (Abr.) Synopsis controversiarum potiorum, quæ Ecclesiæ Christi cum Hæreticis.....Remonstrantibus... .....Calvinianis aliisque intercedunt. 4to. *Francof.*

Not in Brit. Mus.

——— Préjuges legitimes contre le Jansenisme. 8vo. *Cologne.*

——— **Dechamps** (Etienne). Tradition de l'Eglise Catholique et de l'Eglise des hérétiques du dernier siècle, sur la doctrine de Jansenius touchant le libre arbitre et la grace. 8vo. *Paris.*

See 1690.

[1688.] **Fabrus** (Hon.) MS. Synopsis doctrinæ Augustinianæ. pp. 500, 4to.

This MS. is in the Bibl. de Lyon.

Fabrus also left two other MSS. which are in the same library, one "Du pêche originel;" consisting of 6 chapters, and others on predestination and grace.

See De Backer, vol v., p. 294.

1688. [**Quesnel** (Pasq.)] Apologie historique des deux censures de Louvain et de Douai, sur la matière de la grace, etc. 12mo. *Cologne.*

[1688.] **Volckmar** (Joannes) De meritis Adami in statu integro. *Præs.* J. Baggero. 4to. *Hafniæ.*

1688. **Claude** (Jean) Les Œuvres posthumes. 5 vols, 8vo. *Amst.*

Vol. 4, p. 433, De Electione et reprobatione; p. 493, De Statu innocentiæ primi hominis; p. 519, De consequentiis peccati primorum parentum.

——— **Burmannus** (Franc.) Dissertationes iv. de Providentia Divina. 4to. *Rotterd.*

Also author of "Synopsis theologiæ et speciatim œconomiæ fœderum Dei," *Utraj. ad Rhen.*, 1672, 4to; *Amst.*, 1699, 2 vols, 4to.
Neither of the above in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Clarkson** (David.) A Discourse of Saving Grace. 8vo. *Lond.*

Another ed., ed. for the Wycliffe Soc., by B. H. Cooper, 1846, 8vo.
The author was a learned Nonconformist, Fell. of Clare Hall, Camb. He wrote several treatises against Romanism.

——— **Jurien** (Pierre) Traité de la Nature et de la Grace. 12mo. *Rotterd.*

——— ——— Jugement sur les methodes rigides et relachées d'expliquer la providence et la grace, etc. 12mo. *Rotterd.*

——— **Schmidt** (Seb.) Dæ lebre von der Erbsünde, etc. 12mo. *Luneb.*

Also author of "Glauben du Reformirten." (Against Calvinism).

——— **Loescherus** (Casp.) Palladio, calvinianis erepto. 4to. *Vitemb.*

——— **Witte** (Ægid.) Spongia notarum quibus quinque propositiones famosas denuo aspersit Mart. Steyaert, obducta per Palladium, sancti Augustini discipulum. 4to. *Colon.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Verwey** (R.) Provida Dei circa peccata hominum cura. 4to. *Jenæ.*

1689. **Dechamps** (Etienne) Lettres sur l'accord du libre arbitre avec la grace de Jesus Christ. 12mo. *Cologne.*

These letters, which are 9 in number, are addressed to the Prince de Conti.

——— **Rogers** (Thomas) Lux Occidentalis, or Providence displayed in the Coronation of King William and Queen Mary. 4to. *Lond.*

Rector of Shapton, Northamptonshire, 1689.

——— **Resbury** (Nathaniel, *D.D.*) Sermon on Providence. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Lynford** (Thomas, *D.D.*) God's Providence the City's Safety. A Serm. 4to. *Lond.*

The author was Preb. of Westminster.

——— **Bruyn** (Isaac de) Responsio ad Appendicem Pacificum Viri Eximii de mente S. Augustini circa gratiam Christi, &c. 4to. *Lovanii.*

1689. **Cruso** (Tho.) The mighty wonders of a merciful Providence. A Serm. 4to. *Lond.*

Also author of "The period of life determined by the Divine Will," a sermon, *Lond.*, 1688, 4to.

——— Memoires pour servir à l'histoire des controverses nées dans l'église romaine sur la predestinatione et sur la grace depuis le concile de Trente. 12mo. *Colon.*

——— **Arbussus.**—La juste idée de la grace immediate, ou réponse à la critique de la doctrine de M. Jurien. 12mo. *Hag. Comit.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Steyaert** (Mart.) Conclusiones Theologicæ. 4to.

——— ——— Assertio continuata notarum in quinque propositiones famosas, adversus crisin continuatam. 4to.

Neither of the above in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Witte** (Ægid.) Crisis assertiones notarum in propositiones quinque famosas, etc. 4to.

——— ——— Redargutio assertionis continuatæ notarum in quinque propositiones famosas. 4to.

Neither of the above in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Steyaert** (Mart.) Responsio brevis ad redargutionem assertionis continuatæ notarum, cum systemate gratiæ efficacis et sufficientis. 4to.

——— **Witte** (Ægid.) Muscarium ad responsionem brevem Mart. Steyaert, per Palladium, sancti Augustini discipulum. 4to.

——— **Erath** (August.) Conciliatio prædeterminationis physicæ, seu decreti divini intrinsece efficacis cum scientia media, directiva decreti divini extrinsecè efficacis. 4to. *August. Vind.*

——— **Mather** (Cotton, *D.D.*) Memorable Providences relating to Witchcraft and possessions. 8vo. *Lond.*

2nd ed., 1691, 12mo; *Edin.*, 1697, 12mo.
The author was member of the North Church, Boston, New England, d. 1727—8, aged 65. He was a voluminous writer, having published in his lifetime 382 books, many of which however were but single sermons, essays, &c. He was a Fellow of the Royal Society.

——— **Becker** (Theodorus) *Resp.* Disputatio.....de Epicureo illorum errore, qui negant in Deo præscientiam futurorum contingentium. *Præs.* M. Leydeckero. 4to. *Trajecti ad Rhenum.*

——— **Brinckhuys** (Cornelius) *Resp.* Disputatio de Epicureo illorum errore qui negant in Deo præscientiam futurorum contingentium, *Præs.* M. Leydeckero. 8vo. *Trajecti ad Rhenum.*

1690. Causa Arnaldina, seu A. Arnaldus... vindicatus suis ipsius aliorumque scriptis..... quibus S. Augustini ...doctrina de gratia efficaci...explanatur. 8vo.

——— Expositio Augustiniana circa materiam quinque Propositionum. pp. 16, 12mo.

——— **Wittichius** (Christ.) Commentarius de Deo et ejus attributis. 4to. *Amstelœdami.*

"Liber eruditus."—*Walch.*

——— **Dechamps** (Etienne) Défense du secret du Jansénisme contre l'écrit de M. Gery. 12mo. *Paris.*

——— **Baxter** (Rich.) A Defence of Christ and free grace against the Antinomians. pp. 72. 8vo. *Lond.*

Against Crisp.

——— **Beverley** (Tho.) A conciliatory judgment concerning Dr. Crisp's sermons and Mr. Baxter's dissatisfactions in them. pp. 12, 4to. *Lond.*

2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1692, 4to.

——— **Laurentius** (Augustin) Syntagmata Theologica. fol. *Leodii Eburorum.*

Vol. 1—De Deo Prædestinatore, sive de Divina Prædestinatione.

The author was a Jesuit, who d. in 1695.

[1690.] **Poyo** (John) MS. Dissertationes Theologicæ de Scientia, Voluntate, et Providentia Divina. 4to.

The author was a Jesuit, Prof. of theology in Mexico, in the library of the Univ. in which place the MS. is preserved. De Bacher, iv, 596.

1690. **Wedig** (Jo. Hieron. de) Dissertatio Decretorum Dei et liberæ voluntatis humanæ Conciliatrix. *Witteb.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Clericus** (Jo.) Lettre à M. Jurien sur la manière dont il a traité Episcopius dans son tableau du Socinianisme. 8vo. *Amst.*

——— **Leydecker** (Melch.) Synopsis controversiarum de fœdere et testamento Dei, quæ hodie in Belgio moventur. 8vo. *Traject. ad Rh.*

1690—91. **Colberg** (Ehregott Daniel) Das Platonisch-Hermetische Christenthum, &c. 8vo. *Franck. und Leip.*

Cap. iii (original sin.)

1691. **Bagger** (Hans) *Resp.* J. Wandaline fil. de Fundamento Fidei et Salutis Dissertatio iv exhibens doctrinæ Catholicæ de hominis lapsu ejusque consequentibus fundamentalem declarationem. 4to. *Hafniæ.*

——— **Holtzhausenius** (Jo. Christ.) Der lehre der lutherischen kirche von der gnadenwahl. 12mo. *Franck.*

——— **Balthasar** (Hen. Christ.) *Resp.* Henrici.....liber theologicus de vitæ humanæ termino, *etc.* 8vo.

1691. **Baxter** (Richard) An End of Doctrinal Controversies. 8vo, pp. 320. *Lond.*

Original ed., rare.

Baxter admits in his Preface that his title is not intended as "prognostick," but as "didactical and directive," as he is far from expecting an end of controversies. He treats of Decrees, Election, Reprobation, Providence, the Cause of Evil, Original Sin, Freewill, Grace, Perseverance, &c.

——— **Turner** (Bryan, *D.D.*) De primo Peccati Introitu, sive de Lapsu Angelorum et Hominum. 4to. *Lond.*

The author was Rector of Solderne.

——— **Beverley** (Thos.) Praise of the Glory of Grace. 4to. *Lond.*

Another ed., *Lond.*, 1701, 4to; ed. of 1691 not in B. M.

Also author of Good Hope through Grace, *S.D.*

——— [**Gerberon** (Gabr.)] Les Entretiens de Dieu-donné et de Romain. 12mo, pp. 186. *Cologne.*

Treats of Predestination and Grace.

——— [**Quesnel** (P.)] Lettres d'Armand de Bourbon, Prince de Conty; ou l'accord du libre Arbitre avec la grace de J. C. enseigné par ce Prince au P. Dechamps. 12mo. *Cologne.*

2nd ed.

——— **Bethel** (Slingsby) The Providence of God observed through several ages towards this nation. 4to.

2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1697, 8vo.

1691—1700. **Sogia** (Fr. Geo.) In prologam. et in quatuor libros sentent. 4 vols, fol. *Romæ et Saceri.*

Contains—De Scientia Dei et prædestinatione sanctorum.

1691. Censuræ facultatum sacræ theologicæ Lovaniensis ac Duacensis super quibusdam articulis de sacra scriptura gratia et prædestinatione 1586. pp. 118. *Paris.*

——— **Dicellius** (Hi.) Collectio scriptorum orthod. de termino vitæ. 4to. *Leip.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— [**Gerberon** (Gabr.)] Le Juste discernement de la Créance catholique, d'avec les sentimens des Protestans et d'avec ceux des Pélagiens touchant prédestination et la grace; histoire de l'hérésie des Pélagiens. 12mo. *Colog.*

——— **Aranda** (Felipe) De Divini Verbi incarnatione et redemptione generis humani, etc. fol. *Cæsar Augustæ.*

1692. **Massoulie** (Ant.) D. Thomas Aquinas sui Interpres. I. De Divina Motione in ordine Naturali. II. De Libertate creata. III. De Divina Motione in ordine Supernaturali, seu de Divina Gratia. IV. De Divina Motione in Statu Innocentiæ. 2 vols. fol. *Romæ.*

Rare.

Another ed., *Romæ*, 1702, 2 vols.

Les Pere Massoulie a tiré à son ordinaire ses

principes et ses raisonnements, des Œuvres de S. Thomas dont il avoit fait sa principale étude. Il parvoit qu'il avoit aussi lu les Pères, et particulièrement S. Augustin, S. Gregoire et S. Bernard. Il étoit bon Scholastique, solide Mystique, et il savoit avec cela la langue Hebraique. Il étoit fort zela pour la Doctrine de S. Thomas et son école, etc.—*Dupin.*

1692. **Williams** (Daniel, *D.D.*) Gospel Truth stated and vindicated, wherein some of Dr. Crisp's opinions are considered. 12mo. *London.*

Another ed., *Lond.*, 1830, 12mo.

Dr. Williams took nearly the same stand as Baxter.—*Bickersteth's C. S.*, 4th edition, 139, 293.

The author was the founder of the Red Cross St. Library, an eminent Presbyterian. Born at Wrexham, N. Wales, in 1644.

——— **Du Bosc** (Pierre Thomines) Sermons sur divers textes de l'écriture sainte. 4 vols. 8vo. *Rotterd.*

Vol. 1. La doctrine de la Grace. A Sermon with this title was first pub. [*Caen.* ?] 1661, 8vo, transl. into English, *Edinb.*, 1701, 8vo, and *Lond.*, 1811, 8vo.

——— The Covenant of Grace not absolute, but conditional, modestly asserted. 4to. *Lond.*

——— The Trinitarian's Scheme of Religion, concerning Almighty God and Mankind, considered both before and after the Fall. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Verpoortenn** (A. M.) De elapsu Regenitorum e statu Gratiæ. 4to. *Giessæ.*

——— Examen confectionis Pred.

——— Observationes Doctoris Parisiensis in libellum cui titulus est: Doctrinæ Augustinianorum expositio circa materiam, 5 propositionum, quinque articulis comprehensa.

——— Anti Socinien, ou nouvelle Apologie de la Foi Catholique contre lés Sociniens et les Calvinistes. 8vo. *Paris.*

——— [**Gerberon** (Gabr.)] Meditations Chrétiennes sur la providence et la misericorde de Dieu, &c.

——— **Chauncy** (Isa.) Neonomianism unmasked, or the Ancient Gospel pleaded against the new Law or Gospel. 4to. *Lond.*

He also wrote "A Plea for the Ancient Gospel of J. C.," *Lond.*, 1697, 4to.

He d. in 1712.

——— [**Gerberon** (Gabr.)] Sanctus Anselmus per se docens: sive sententiæ de natura et gratia, ex ejus operibus selectæ. 12mo. *Deph.*

——— Dialogus inter sanctum Anselmum et Bosonem ejus discipulum. 12mo. *Colone.*

——— **Hanneken** (P. L.) De vanitate et periculo fati, quod est in dogmate absoluti decreti in eccles. reformatorum. 4to. *Giessæ.*

1693. **Buchius** (Paul) The Divine Being and its attributes philosophically demonstrated. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Blount** (Charles) The Oracles of Reason. 8vo. *Lond.*

Treats of the Fall of Man.

Examined by King (Josiah) 1698, 8vo. Answered by Lowde (J.), 1699, 12mo, and by Nicholls, (W.) 1696, 8vo.

——— **Hawkins** (T.) Doctrine of Original Sin briefly stated and defended. A Sermon. 8vo.

[1693.] **Abarca** (Pet. de) Tractatus Theologici de Scientia Dei, de concordia, de Voluntate, de Prædestinatione, &c. 4to.

See De Backer, vol. ii, p. 1.

1693. Les Imaginaires, avec la Traité de la Foy humaine et le Jugement de S. Augustin sur la Grace. 3 vols. 12mo. *Mons.*

This is by Nicole and Arnauld.

——— **Edwards** (Jonathan, *D.D.*) A Preservation against Socinianism. 4to. *Oxon.*

3rd ed., 4 parts [1697] 1703, 4to.

The author was Principal of Jesus Coll., Oxf., and Rector of Kiddington, Oxford.

The work is of great merit and value.

——— **Edwards** (Thos.) Impartial Inquiry into Gospel Truth as stated and vindicated by Dr. D. Williams. pp. 48. 4to. *Lond.*

——— ——— A short review of some Reflexions made by a nameless author upon Dr. Crisp's Sermon in Crispinianism unmasked. 4to. *Lond.*

Dr. Crisp's sermons were 52 in number with the title "Christ alone exalted," *Lond.*, 1643—46, 8vo; 1791, 8vo.

For an account of the Controversy, see *Bickersteth's Christian Student.*

——— **Smith** (Thos., *D.D.*) A Discourse concerning Divine Providence in relation to National Judgment. 4to. *Lond.*

The license could not be obtained from the Bp. of London's chaplain, before the author had struck out two or three passages which the Chaplain said reflected on the government.

——— **Beverley** (Thos.) The true state of Gospel Truth established upon the free election of God in Christ. pp. 56. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Aranda** (Felipe) De Deo Sciente, prædestinante et auxiliante, seu Schola scientiæ mediæ. pp. 1002. fol. *Cæsar Augustæ.*

——— **Cross** (Walter) A Compend. of the Covenant of Grace, as the most solid support under the most terrible conflicts of Death. 4to. *Lond.*

The author was an English dissenting minister, who d. 1701.

——— **Olearius** (Jo.) Synopsis errorum Arminianorum, juxta seriem locorum theologicorum in antithesi catholica succincte discussorum. 4to. *Lips.*

1694. **Pelling** (Edw.) *D.D.* A practical discourse concerning God's love to Mankind. pp. 135. 8vo. *Lond.*

The author was Chaplain in Ordinary to Will. and Mary, and Rector of Petworth, in Sussex.

——— **Owen** (Jonathan) England's warning by late frowning Providences, a sermon. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Gregory** (Thomas) The doctrine of God's Providence vindicated and asserted. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Nokesius** (Will.) Dissertatio de Lege Socinianis et Arminianis opposita. 12mo. *Lond.*

——— **Haworth** (Will.) Absolute Election of Persons not upon foreseen conditions, stated and maintained in some sermons. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Olearius** (Jo.) De subjecto immediato peccati originalis. *Lips.*

——— **Beausobre** (Isa. de) Défense de la doctrine des reformées sur la providence, sur la prédestination, sur la grace, &c. 8vo. *Magdeb.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

The author was an eminent French Calvinist, b. in Switzerland, 1659. He became minister to the French Refugees at Berlin, where he d. in 1738.

——— **Sonntagius** (Christ.) Venenum matæologiæ Arminianæ. 4to. *Altdorsii.*

——— **Shower** (John) The day of grace: or a discourse concerning the possibility and fear of its being past before death, shewing the groundless doubts and mistaken apprehensions of some as to their being finally forsaken and lost of God. Four sermons. 12mo.

As to the author, see Middleton's Biog. Evang., iv., 214.

——— **Rowbothamus** (Jo.) Disquisitio in Hypothesin Baxterianam de Fœdere gratiæ ab Initio, etc. 8vo. *Lond.*

Other eds., 1695, 1698, 8vo.

The author was minister of Upminster, Essex, ejected for nonconformity, 1662.

——— **Mackworth** (Sir Humph.) Treatise concerning Providence.

——— **Baxter** (Rich.) Universal Redemption of Mankind stated and cleared [ed. by J. Read]. pp. 502, 8vo. *Lond.*

This was published from Mr. Baxter's MS. given to Mr. Jos. Read.

——— The Providence of God observed through several ages to this nation, in introducing the true religion. 12mo. *Lond.*

——— **Sherlock** (Will., *D.D.*) Discourse concerning the Divine Providence. 8vo. *Lond.*

Sevl. eds., 1705, 1715, 8vo; 1725, 8vo; 1737, 8vo, 4to, and 12mo.

Transl. into French and German, the latter with a preface by Mosheim, *Hamb.*, 1726, 1732, 1744, 1755, 8vo.

The author was Preb. of St. Paul's, 1681; Master of the Temple, 1684; Dean of St. Paul's, 1691, and d. 1707, aged 67.

Burnet says he was "clear, polite, and a strong writer, but apt to assume too much to himself, and to treat his adversaries with contempt."

1694. **Elis** (John) Articulorum xxxix Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ defensio. 12mo.

Art. xvii.

The author was a native of Merionethshire, and was Rector of St. Mary's, Dolgelley, about 1647. He died 1665.

Other eds., *Amst.*, 1696, 12mo; and 1700, 12mo; 1720, 8vo. In Engl., 1700, 12mo; 1710, 12mo.

1695. **Leydecker** (Melch.) Historia Jansenismi. 8vo. *Traj. ad Rhen.*

A Calvinist theologian.

See Walch, ii., 934; see too his De republica Hebræorum, *Amst.*, 1704, fol.

——— **Benois.**—Hist. de l'Edit de Nantes. 5 vols, 4to. *Delf.*

(Calvinistic).

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Fowler** (Edward) A discourse on the Great Disingenuity and unreasonableness of Repining at affecting Providences, and of the Influence which they ought to have upon us, etc. 12mo. *Lond.*

Another ed., 1707, 8vo.

Fowler was also author of a Treatise of Christian Liberty, *Lond.*, 1680, 8vo.

He was Bishop of Gloucester.

——— **Gifford** (George) The great Mystery of Providence, the substance of several sermons. 4to.

——— **Goodwin** (Tho.) A Discourse of the true nature of the gospel demonstrating that it is no new law but a pure doctrine of grace. 4to. *Lond.*

The author was son of the Goodwin mentioned 1643, and pastor of a Dissenting congregation at Pinner.

He was a Calvinist.

——— **Garzia de Londogno** (N.) Nova et brevis de prædestinatione controversia, et concordantia. 12mo. *Bassani.*

——— **Noris** (Henr. de) Dissertatio historica de uno ex Trinitate carne passo; accedunt ejusdem vindiciæ historiæ Pelagianæ ab anonymi scrupulis. 4to. *Romæ.*

——— **Horchius** (Henr.) Noctium Nassovicarum semestre primum, exhibens elementa χαριτομετρίας, ad investigandas gratiæ divinæ dimensiones et promovendam pacem inter Protestantes. 8vo. *Herbornæ.*

1696. **Lorimer** (Will.) Remarks on Goodwin's Discourse of the Gospel. 4to. *Lond.*

Written to prove that the gospel covenant is a law of grace.

——— [**Gerberon** (Gabr.)] Defensio Ecclesiæ Romanæ Catholicæque veritatis de gratiâ adversus J. Leydeckeri.

This work favouring Jansenism was condemned at Rome, 1696.

The author was probably Gerberon.

1696. [Barcos (M. de)] Exposition de la Foi Catholique touchant la Grâce et la Prédestination.
pp. 275, 12mo. *Mons.*

——— Edwards (John, *D.D.*) A Demonstration of the Existence and Providence of God. 8vo. *Lond.*
The 1st ed. was *Lond.*, 1690, 8vo.
The author for some time held the living of St. Peter's, Colchester. He was a zealous Calvinist, and by them is asserted to have been the most valuable writer of his day. He invariably confounded Arminianism with Romanism.
He d. 1716, aged 79.

——— An Antidote against some principal errors of the Predestinarians.
pp. 43, 12mo. *Lond.*

——— Nicholls (W., *D.D.*) A Conference with a Theist, wherein the lapse of Mankind is defended. 8vo.

——— Bay (M. de) Opera.
4to. *Coloniæ.*
Contains "De peccato originis."

——— Le Clerc (J.) A short History of Pelagianism. pp. 55. 8vo. *Lond.*
At the end of a Translation from the French of his Lives of Clement of Alexandria, Eusebius, and others. It is not of much account.

——— Witsius (Herm.) Animadversiones irenicæ ad controversias quæ, sub infaustis Antinomorum et Neonomorum nominibus, in Britannia nunc agitantur. 12mo. *Ultrajecti.*
Trans. into Eng. by T. Bell, *Glasgow*, 1807, 12mo.

——— Runde (Jo. Balthasarus) De Fato Christiano. 4to. *Witteb.*

——— Kahlerus (Jo.) De imputatione peccati alieni, in primis adamitici.
Rintel.

——— Locqueneux (J. B.) Conclusiones theologicæ de authoritate Ecclesiæ in profliganda hæresi Janseniana; sub præsidio J. B. L. propugnatæ.
4to. *Duaci.*

——— [Quesnel (Pas.)] Défense de l'Eglise Romaine et des souverains Pontifes, contre Melchior Leydecker.
12mo. *Liege.*

[1696. Gerberon (G.)] Norisius aut Jansenianus, aut non Augustinianus demonstratus.
Another ed., *Rouen*, 1699.
This is a refutation of an Apology which Card. Noris published, justifying himself from the charge of holding Jansenist views. See De Lama Bibl. de St. Maur., p 101.

[1696. Gerberon (G.)] Notationes brevissimæ in notionem humanæ libertatis ab Antonio Arnaldo delineatam per Hubertum.

1696. Sfondrati (Cœl., *Cardinal*) Nodus Prædestinationis, ex sacris litteris doctrinaque SS. Augustini et Thomæ dissolutus. 4to. *Romæ.*
This work according to Mosheim threw into combustion a considerable part of the Roman division of the Church, see *Acta Erud.*, 1697, pp. 281—293.
Other ed., *Romæ*, 1697, p. xii and 271, 4to; *Col.*, 1698, 8vo; *Colon.-Agr.*, 1705, 8vo, 2 vols. For a full and excellent account of the work, see Walch Biblio. Theol. ii., 959—961.

1697. Doctrine Augustinienne de l'Eglise Romaine débarrassee du nœud du Cardinal Sfondrat, par plusieurs Disciples de S. Augustin.

——— Growth of Error, being an Exercitation concerning the Rise and Progress of Arminianism and Socinianism.
8vo.

——— Histoire abrégée du Jansenisme.
8vo. *Cologne.*
See Journal de Berlin, 1697, p. 549.

——— Epistola Ecclesiæ Principium ad Innocentium XII. contra Librum cui titulus est 'Nodus Prædestinationis.'
4to. *Paris.*

——— Bossuet (Jacq. Ben.) Epistola... ...contra librum cui titulus est 'Nodus Prædestinationis,' &c., Auctore Sfondrato. 4to. *Par.*
This curious letter of Bossuet's was an application to the Pope for the condemnation of Sfondrati—but it was unsuccessful.

——— Edwards (John, *D.D.*) Brief remarks upon Mr. Whiston's new theory of the earth, and upon another gentleman's objections against some passages in a discourse of the Existence and Providence of God, relating to the Copernican hypothesis.
pp. 48. 8vo. *Lond.*
Edwards was an eminent Calvinist divine: Fell. of Trinity Coll., Cambridge, and Minister of Trin. Church, Camb., 1664. He is said to have been the Paul, the Augustine, the Brawardine, the Calvin of his age.—Dr. Kippis, *Biog. Brit.*

——— Caselius (Martinus) *Resp.* Ἐπεξήγησις Cap. III. Gen. de lapsu primorum parentum. Præs. J. Hulsemanno. 8vo.

——— Theologica lucerna Caliginosis in veritatis locis. 4to. *Genevæ.*
Treats of predestination.

——— Turner (Will.) Compleat History of the most remarkable Providences.
fol.
This is a very curious work. The author was Vicar of Walberton in Sussex.

——— Geiger (Fred.) Theses Theologicæ de peccatis et gratia. 4to. *Bambergæ.*
The author was a Jesuit, d. 1734. See De Backer, v. 223.

——— Feverlinus (Jo. Conrad.) Von der allgemeinen Gnade Gottes.
8vo. *Norimb.*

——— [Gerberon (Gabr.)] Défense de l'Eglise Romaine et des souverains pontifes sur la grâce contre Melchior Leydeker. 8vo. *Leod.*
As to this work see *Walch Bibl. Theol.*, ii, 934, 935, and *De Lama Bibl. de Saint Maur*, 100.

1697. [**Gerberon** (Gabr.)] Disquisitiones duæ de gratuita prædestinatione et gratia se ipsa efficaci, auctore Mart. Duchesne. pp. 81. 12mo. *Paris.*
Condemned 8th May, 1697.

——— **Bogdanovitz** (Bern.) Philosophia Christiana dogmaticarum veritatum de Creatione, et Recreatione Hominis. pp. 650. fol. *Romæ.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Rassler** (Christ.) Controversia Theologica. De Physica Prædeterminatione. pp. 282. sm. 8vo. *Ingolst.*
The author was a learned Jesuit, and his work is valuable and rare.

1698. **Serre** (A.) De l'autoritaté de S. Augustin touchant la matière de la grâce ; première partie, de la prédestination. 8vo. *Paris.*

——— [**Gerberon** (Gabr.)] Traduction du traité de S. Augustin de la grâce et du libre arbitre—Traduction du traité de S. Bernard de la grâce et du libre arbitre. 12mo. *Toulouse.*

——— ——— La véritable lettre de M. Abbé le Bossu sur le livre du Cardinal Sfondrati, intitulé ; Nodus prædestinationis dissolutus. *Paris.*

——— ——— Histoire abrégée du Jansénisme. pp. 176. 12mo. *Cologne.*

——— ——— Lettre d'un théologien a Mgr. l'évêque de Meaux.....also a second letter. 12mo. *Toulouse.*

——— ——— Le Chrétien désabusé sur le sujet de la grâce.

——— **Grapius** (Zach.) Dissertatio controversiam recentiorem theologicam Paionismi, in Gallia et Belgio huc usque agitatam, de verbi divini influxu in conversionem exhibens. *Rostoch.*

——— **Noris** (Hen. de) Vindiciæ Augustinianæ, Historia Pelagiana, et Dissert. de Synodo Œcumenica. fol. *Salamanticæ.*
Another ed., *Lyon*, 1707, fol. See 1677.

——— **Harris** (John) A Refutation of the Atheistical objections against the Being and Attributes of God. 4to. *Lond.*

——— [**Grancolas** (Jean)] La Tradition de l'Eglise sur le péché originel ; et sur la réprobation des enfans morts sans baptême. 12mo. *Paris.*
Another ed., *Paris*, 1714, 8vo. See Jour. des Savans, May 12, 1698.

——— [**Quesnel** (Pasq.)] Histoire du formulaire qu'on a fait signer en France, et de la paix que le Pape Clement IX a rendue à cette Eglise en 1668. 12mo.

——— **Serry** (J. H.) Exposition du chapitre IX de l'épître aux Romains. 8vo. *Paris.*

1698. **Keach** (Benj.) The display of Glorious Grace. 8vo.
A Calvinistic Baptist, d. 1704. Also author of a Sermon on "The Excellent Nature of the Covenant of Grace," 1693, 4to.

——— **Pritius** (J. G.) De Pelagianismo orthodoxæ ecclesiæ. 4to. *Lips.*

——— [**Daniel** (Gabr.)] Lettres au R. P. [Nat.] Alexandre dans lesquelles on fait le parallèle de la doctrine des Thomistes avec celle des Jésuites, sur la probabilité et sur la grâce. 12mo. *Cologne.*
Ed. in latin, *Aug. Vind.*, 1700, 12mo. Another ed., *Cologne*, 1704, 12mo.

——— Recueil de plusieurs pièces pour la défense de la morale et de la grâce de J. C. contre un libelle d'un P. Jésuite. 2 vols. 12mo. *Cologne.*

——— Instruction sur la doctrine de la grace. 8vo. *Brux.*

——— [**Turner** (John)] A Physico-Theological Discourse upon the Divine Being, the Providence of God, &c., with letters betwixt the author and Dr. A. Horneck. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Whaley** (Nath.) Two Sermons... ...with a Discourse shewing the consistency of God's infinite goodness with His foreknowledge of the Fall of Man. 8vo. *Lond.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

1699. **Le Blanc** (Aug.) [Serry, J. H.] Historiæ congregationum de Auxiliis Divinæ Gratiæ sub. Clem. VIII. et Paul V. fol. *Mogunt.*
Another ed., *Lovan.*, 1700, fol.
The Appendix to the work is especially valuable.
Other ed., *Antw.*, 1709, fol. ; 1740, fol. In Italian, *Brescia*, 1771, 4to.
Serry's Opera Omnia, *Lugd.*, 1770, 6 vols, fol.
The History was condemned in 1701 by a decree of the Inquisitor General of Spain as "contenant des Propositions scandaleuses, séditieuses, injurieuses aux Souverains Pontifes, au saint office à un Grand Inquisiteur....et à plusieurs hommes illustres." Nemo tamen majore conatu et deligentia totam hanc Historiam secundum typum et traditiones hujus partis collegit quam Hyac. Serrius, Dominicanus, assumpto primum Aug. le Blanc, nomine fictitio, cujus Historia edita ingenti cum plausu ab iis quorum intererat, excepta est."—*Weissman.*
The Congregation de Auxiliis was instituted to inquire into the differences between the Dominicans and the Jesuits on the Doctrine of Divine Grace.
"Serry était un homme de beaucoup d'érudition."—*Dict. des Auteurs Eccles.*

——— **Henningius** (Jac.) Ecclesiæ reformatæ hypotheses justitiæ divinæ essentiali adversæ. *Gryph.*

——— **Burnet** (Gilb., *Bp. of Salisbury*) An Exposition of the 39 Articles. fol. *Lond.*
Various eds., 2nd, *Lond.*, 1700, 1705, 1720, 1737, fol. ; 3rd, *Dublin*, 1724 ; *Lond.*, 1796, 8vo ; 1805, 8vo ; 1837, 1841, 8vo ; 1843, 8vo ; *Oxf.*, 1845, 8vo

An Analysis, *Lond.*, 1829, 12mo; 1832, 12mo. Questions on, 1838, 8vo; 1847, 8vo.

A most valuable work, particularly the exposition of the 17th Article. This exposition displays a masterly knowledge of the subject of the differences between the Calvinists and the Arminians. The work was undertaken at the request of Q. Mary, seconded by Archbp. Tillotson, and was perused and approved by the latter and Archbps. Tenison and Sharp, and Bishops Stillingfleet, Patrick, Lloyd, Williams, and Moore. It was censured by the LowerHouse of Convocation in 1701, as allowing a diversity of opinions which the articles were passed to prevent, and as containing passages contrary to the articles and the teaching of the Church. It, however, has lived down opposition.

The exposition of the 17th Article is undoubtedly the most important dissertation which has yet appeared on the subject.

Reflections on this work by Edwards (J., *D.D.*) 1701, 8vo.

1699—1703. **Place** (Josh. de la) Les Œuvres. 2 vols, 4to. *Frank.*

Vol. I. contains treatises on the imputation of Adam's sin, and the order of the Divine Decrees, and on Freewill.

1699. **[Palœolophilus** (Vicentius)] Gratia triumphans de novis liberi arbitrii decomptoribus, inflatoribus, deceptoribus, &c. *Delphis.*

"Cet ouvrage Flamand, dont le titre est sibizarre, a été condamné par les archivêques de Cologne et de Malines."—*Dict. liv. Jansen.*

See too *Walch, Bibl. Theol. ii.*, 949.

——— **Du Bosc** (Pierre Thomines) Sermons sur divers Textes de l'écriture sainte. 4 vols, 8vo. *Rotterd.*

——— **[Serry** (J. H.)] Lettre de l'auteur de l'hist. de la congr. de Auxiliis, pour servir de réponse à la lettre du secretaire de Liege. pp. 64, 12mo. *S.L.*

Against the Jesuists.

——— Libelli Joan de Palazoi contra Jansenismum confutatio per Belgas Theologos. 8vo.

——— Exposition de la foi catholique touchant la grâce de la prédestination. 12mo. *Mons.*

——— **Specht** (Georges) Theses theologicæ de peccatis et Gratia. 4to. *Bambergæ.*

The author was a Jesuit, teacher of philosophy at Bamberg and Heiligenstadt, and of theology at Bamberg.

He died in 1704.

De Bacher, vi., 666.

——— A very short account of the Free Justification of God's Elect. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **[Dumas** (Hilaire)] Histoire des cinq propositions de Jansenius. 2 vols, 12mo. *Liege.*

Another ed., *Leod.*, 1700, 2 vols, 12mo; *Trebour*, 1702, 3 vols, 12mo

By some ascribed to Tellier.

The author was a doctor of the Sorborne, and died in 1742.

1699. Recueil historique des bulles et constitutions brefs décrets et autres actes concernant les erreurs de ces deux derniers siècles, tant dans les matières de la foy, &c. 8vo. *Mons.*

——— [1695.] **A** (S.) Dying Infants Sav'd by Grace. 4to. *Lond.*

——— Réflexions sur les Constitutions et Brefs de nos Saints Pères les Papes Innocent X, Alexandre VII, et Innocent XII, touchant la condemnation des cinq Propositions. *Cologne.*

——— **[Gerberon** (Gabr.)] Traité historique sur la Grâce et de Prédestination, etc., par l'Abbé de Saint Julien. 12mo. *Sens.*

It is an apology for Baianism and Jansenism, and was condemned by the Archbp. of Malines in 1704.

——— **Zentgravius** (J. J.) Repetitio Doctrinæ de Electione. 4to. *Argent.*

This ed. not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Bonnières de Lousatre** (Jos. de) Système de M. Nicole touchant la Grâce universelle. 12mo. *Cologne.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

The author was a Roman Catholic.

——— **[Gabrielli** (Giovanni Maria)] Dispunctio Notarum XL,quas scriptor anonymus eminentissimi Cardinalis Sfondrati libro cui titulus: Nodus Prædestinationis, etc., inussit. 8vo. *Colon.*

See Acta Erud., 1700, pp. 385—396.

——— Disquisitiones de gratuita prædestinatione et de gratia, se, ipsa efficaci. 8vo.

Against Sfondrati.

——— - **Le Masson** (Innoc.) Enchiridion salutis operandæ per gratiam Christi. 12mo.

——— **H[all]** (R[obert]) Some Arguments and Considerations as answer to that Grand question, Whether Men can Will and Do otherwise than what they do? pp. 28, 12mo. *Lond.*

Very rare and valuable. It is in answer to a Discourse called "A Refutation of that Atheistical Notion of Absolute Necessity."

——— ——— Differences about Predetermination, shewing from Scripture, Reason and Experience that man is a Necessary Agent. pp. 78, 12mo. *Lond.*

Very rare, much of it is in verse.

1700—1799.

1700. **Decker** (L. C. de) Jansenismi historia brevis. 12mo. *Lovanii.*

——— Apologia secunda panegyreos Jansenianæ, configens Jansenianismi historiam brevem, corrasam à L. C. Deckero. 4to. *Gratianopoli.*

Neither this nor the last in the Brit. Mus.
Also in Opuscula, *Lovanii*, 1703, 8vo.

——— **Chauncy** (Isa.) Alexipharmacon, or a fresh Antidote against Neonomian bane and poyson to the Protestant Religion. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Germon** (Barth.) Lettres et questions importantes sur l'histoire des Congrégations de Auxiliis. 8vo. *Liege.*

——— Collectio variorum scriptorum adversus librum cui titulus: Nodus præ destinationis; sive Augustiniana Ecclesiæ Romanæ doctrina à Card. Sfondrati Nodo extricata per varios S. Augustini discipulos. 12mo. *Colon.*

Contains 7 tracts in opposition to Sfondrati, for an account of which see *Acta Erud.*, 1701, pp. 65—68.

——— **Arbuthnot** (John) Argument for Divine Providence, drawn from the equal number of births of both sexes. Phil. Trans., No. 328.

The author was an Eminent Physician, a *F.R.S.* He was Physician Extraordinary to Queen Anne, d. 1734—5.

The equality of males and females he shews is not the blind effect of chance, but Divine Providence works it for a good end. He instances births from 1629 to 1700, shewing that more males are born than females, and that almost in a constant proportion. This he considered necessary on account of wars, etc. He is of opinion that this equality in the births has no other probability from physics than that in our first parents' seed there were at first formed an equal number of both sexes. He draws this scholium from the whole, that it follows from hence that polygamy is contrary to the law of nature and to the propagation of the human race.

——— **Ness** (Christopher) An Antidote against Arminianism. 12mo. *Lond.*

3rd ed. by J. A. Jones, *Plymouth*, 1819, pp. 156, 12mo; a 5th by J. A. Jones, 1836, 18mo.

The author was lecturer to Dr. Lake, afterwards Bp. of Chichester, and subsequently became a Nonconformist. He was an able divine.

He d. 1705, aged 84.

1700. **Manfredi** (Antoine) Preliche Quaresimali Parte Seconda. 4to. *Neapoli.*

Sermons on Grace and Presdestination.

——— Tractatus dogmaticus de vocatione Gentium. 8vo.

——— **Keith** (Geo.) A Letter to George Keith, concerning the Salvability of the Heathen. 4to. *Lond.*

Author of "The Universal Free Grace of the Gospel asserted," 1671, 4to.

——— **Kahlerus** (Jo.) De prædicatione evangelii universali. *Rintel.*

——— **Macon** (Innoc. le) Enchiridion salutis operandæ per gratiam Christi. 8vo. *Correriæ.*

——— [**Arnauld** (Ant.)] Instruction sur la Grâce selon l'Ecriture et les Pères. 8vo. *Cologne.*

Condemned at Rome, 11 March, 1704.

——— **St. Leo Magnus.** Opera Omnia nunc primum epistolis XXX tribus que de Gratia Christi opusculis auctiora. 2 vols. fol. *Lugd.*

De vocatione omnium gentium—De auctore librorum de vocatione gentium.

The best edition is in 3 vols, fol, *Venet.*, 1753—57

——— [**Quesnel** (Pas.)] La foi et l'innocence du clergè de Hollande, défendues contre un libelle diffamatoire, intitulé Mémoire touchant le progrès du Jansénisme en Hollande, par M. Dubois. 12mo. *Delft.*

The work in reply to which this was written was by Louis Doncin, a Jesuit.

——— ——— La paix de Clement IX, ou démonstration de deux faussetés capitales avancées dans l'histoire des cinq propositions. 12mo. *Chambery.*

——— **Muniessa** (Thos.) Disputationes Scholasticæ de Providentia Dei, etc. fol. pp. 560. *Cæsar Aug.*

——— **Breithauptus** (Joach. Just.) De vocatione primaria et secundaria. *Halæ.*

(Effectual calling.)
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Engels** (Paul. Matt.) Sententia de Gratiæ revocatricis termino adversus Novaturiensium vellicationes defenditur. 4to. *Lips.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

1700. **Pictet** (Bened.) Vir. immortal. et beatæ memoriæ Lutheri et Calvini consensum in quæstionibus de Prædestinatione et redemptione Jesu Christi. 8vo. *Genev.*

To this and a previous work in 1697, Scultetus (D. G.) wrote a reply, *Lips.*, 1701, 8vo, and Mœbius (Jo.) also, *Lips.*, 1699, and 1702, 4to. Pictetus answered, *Genev.*, 1700, 8vo. Mœbius replied to this, *Lips.*, 1702, 4to. See further as to this discussion, Walch, Bibl. Theol., ii, 454.

——— **Hermann** (P.) Jubilæum Apostolicæ prædestinationis. 4to. *Witteb.*

——— [**Gerberon** (Gabr.)] Discordiæ Jansenianæ enarratio.

To this work Opstrætus (Jo.) wrote an answer, to which Gerberon replied in Paterna admonitione ad Jo. Opstrætum.

——— ——— Abrégé de la doctrine Chrét. touchant la prédestination et la grâce, contre les semi-Pelagiens, calomniateurs de St. Augustin. *Utrecht.*

——— ——— Histoire générale du Jansenisme. 3 vols. pp. 549, 517, 475. 12mo. *Amst.*

Another ed., *Amst.*, 1780, 3 vols, 8vo.

A very valuable and accurate work favouring Jansenism. In præfatione auctor Masii scriptoris paullo ante memoratæ *historiæ quinque propositionum Jansenii* fidem suspectam dubiamque reddit; in ipso libro autem multa rariora, ab aliis prætermissa, tradit ac scripta utriusque partis eorumque argumenta diligenter recenset. — *Walch*, Bibl. Theol. ii. 935, 936.

——— [**Porcq** (Jean le)] Les sentimens de Saint Augustin sur la grâce, opposés à ceux de Jansensius. 2nd ed. 4to. *Lugd.*

——— **Nye** (Steph.) The System of Grace and Freewill. A Visit. Sermon. 4to. *Lond.*

The author was Rector of Little Hormead, Herts.

——— Lettre su l'istoria de Auxiliis divinæ Graciæ divolgata ultimamente sotto il nome del P. Agostino le Blanch. 12mo. *Nell.*

——— **Gesvres** (Franc.) Defensio Arnaldina, sive Analytica Synopsis libri de Corruptione et Gratiâ ab omnibus reprehensorum calumniis vindicata. 12mo. pp. 785. *Anvers.*

Another ed., *Geneva*, see De Lama Bibl. de Saint Maur, 74.

The author d. 1705.

——— Cogitationum novarum de primo et secundo Adamo. 8vo. *Amstel.*

——— **Steinmetz** (Jo.) De Peccato originali ex primitiva ejus sede vel lapsus protoplastorum historia. 4to. *Witteb.*

——— **Fechtius** (Jo.) Disputatio theologica de termino divinæ gratiæ, sub. præside J. F. 4to. *Rost.*

1701. **Coccejus** (John) Opera omnia. 10 vols. fol. *Amst.*

Vol. 7. Disputationes selectæ.
De Prædestinatione.
De natura et gratia. De Reprobatione.
De Electione. De Catena Salutis.

Anekdota, vol. 2, p. 494. Explicatio Analytica, Rom. 9.

The author was a Hebrew professor at Bremen, and died at Leyden in 1669.

His "Summa doctrinæ de Fœdere et Testamento Dei," *Lug. Bat.*, 1654, 12mo.

Another ed., *Amstel.*, 1706, fol.

1701. **Smith** (John) On Universal Redemption, part 1. 8vo. *London.*

——— **Powell** (Wilhel) De Præsentia Dei, Natura liberi Arbitrii et conciliatione utriusque. 4to. *Lug. Bat.*

——— **Stafford's** Great Duty of Perseverance necessary to Salvation. 8vo.

——— Epitome Doctrinæ Christianæ quoad Prædestinationem et gratiam.

——— **Quesnel** (Pas.) Défense de l'Histoire des cinq propositions de Jansenius. 12mo. *Liege.*

By some ascribed to Hilaire Dumas.

——— **Limborch** (Phil. a) Historia Vitæ Simonis Episcopii. 8vo. *Amstel. apud Galletum.*

Very rare.

Brandt, the Remonstrant historian in his days was never able to obtain a copy. In his preface to his life of Arminius he says, "Illud inveniendum restat, quo magis de hujus operis utilitate lectoribus constet, fuisse Cl. Simonis Episcopii Vitam a Phil. Limborchio, dignissimo Remonstrantium Theologiæ Professore, olim concionibus ejus præfixam, in exterorum gratiam a literarum humaniorum amantissimo in latinum sermonem haud infeliciter versam, et in eadem, qua hanc exhibemus, forma, in hac urbe *Ap. Galletum*, An. 1701, vulgarum, sed nescio quo fato hujus editionis exemplaria tam rara esse, ut vix unam inspiciendi nobis copia facta fuerit. Quod si reliqua e carceribus, quibus detineri dicuntur, liberari contingat, eaque Episcopii Vita hisce de Arminio commentariis subjungatur, duobus illis Voluminibus quadragenta annorum serie Remonstrantium rerum incunabula et fata agnoscere licebat." See Vogt. Cat. lib. rarior, p. 412; Lilienthal's Theol. Bibl., vol. i, p. 876; Walch ii, 533.

——— **Rechenbergius** (Adam.) De divinæ gratiæ termino. 4to. *Lips.*

——— ——— Parenesis super Thomæ Ittigii prælectionibus de statu induratorum, temerè publicatis. 4to. *Lips.*

——— **Ittigius** (Tho.) Refutatio disputationis de statu induratorum ad Val. Alberti interesse religionum, ejusque thesin secundam. 4to. *Witteb.*

——— ——— Epistola, qua prælectiones de statu induratorum, adversus Adami Rechenbérgii parænesin vindicantur. 4to. *Lips.*

——— ——— Prælectiones publicæ, termino gratiæ peremptoris, in nupera disputatione de statu induratorum denuo asserto, oppositæ. 4to.

——— [**Serry** (J. H.)] Defensio historiæ congregationum de auxiliis adversus querelam Caroli Gaspar. Metzenii. pp. 90. 12mo. *Lovanii.*

This is a rare work.

1701. Défense de l'histoire des cinq propositions de Jansénius. 8vo. *Liege.*

——— Réflexions morales sur les ouvrages de Dieu dans l'ordre de la nature et de la grâce. 8vo. *Paris.*

——— Questions importantes à l'occasion de la nouvelle histoire des congregations de Auxiliis. 8vo. *Liege.*

——— **Beverley** (Tho.) A Memorial of the Glory of Grace. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Burnet** (Gilb.) Tractatus de Prædestinatione et gratia. 8vo. *Berolini.*

This is simply taken from the author's work on the 39 Articles, being in fact his exposition of Article 17.

——— **Scultetus** (Dan. Lever.) Adsertio amplissimæ divinæ gratiæ, ad responsionem Bened. Picteti repetita. 8vo. *Lips.*

——— [**Gerberon** (Gabr.)] Le Chrétien désabuse sur le sujet de la grace.

——— Deux traitez de S. Augustin les livres de l'ordre, et les livres du libre arbitre, traduits en françois sur l'edition latine des P. P. Benedectins, par Phillippe Goiband du Bois. 8vo. *Paris.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Souartre.** Système prétendu de M. Nicole touchant la grâce universelle. 12mo. *Cologne.*

The author was a Jesuit, and the writer of another on the same subject as the above, *Amst.*, 1703, 12mo.

——— [**Desbordes des Doires** (Olivier)] La Science du salut, renfermée dans ces deux paroles: Il y a peu d'élus; ou traité dogmatique sur le nombre des élus, par M. D'Amelincourt. 2 vols. pp. 248, 224. 12mo. *Rouen.*

Not apparently in B. M.

——— **Mullerus** (Mich.) Exercitatio theologica de pœnitentia indurati. 4to. *Tub.*

——— **Jagerus** (Joh. Wolf.) Exercitatio academica de fœdere gratiæ. 4to. *Stutt.*

Another ed., *Francof.*, 1712.

——— **Pirlæus** (G.) De tempore gratiæ divinæ non nisi cum morte hominis elabente. 4to. *Witteb.*

——— **Clifford** (Samuel) An account of the judgment of Mr. Baxter concerning the imputation of Adam's sin. 4to.

1702. Errata de l'histoire des congregations de auxiliis. 8vo. *Liege.*

——— **Knaggs** (Thomas) Divine Providence, on Prov. xxiii, 17, 18. 4to.

——— **Kingston** (Richard) A Discourse on Divine Providence. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Vincentius.** — Tractatus de Divina prædestinatione sanctorum, et impiorum reprobatione. *Compluti.*

1702. **Du Vivier** (Franc.) Lettres de M. Cornelius Jansenius, et de quelques autres personnes à M. Jean du Verger de Hauranne, abbé de S. Ciran, avec des remarques Historiques et Theologiques. 12mo. pp. 326. *Cologne.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Moerl** (Gust. Phil.) Vindiciæ doctrinæ de gratia prædestinationis. 8vo. *Norimb.*

——— **Edzardus** (Sebast.) De termino gratiæ ante mortem, consensu Theologorum destituto, schediasma. 4to. *Hamburgi.*

——— **Vinitor** (M. J.) Specimen vindiciarum. 4to. *Magdeb.*

——— **Gerhardus** (J. E.) Perennitas fœderis gratiæ, per singulas fœderum œconomias demonstrata ex Actor. Apost. cap. xv., ver. 11, præside J. E. G. 4to. *Giessæ.*

——— **Antonius** (Paul) Tractatus theologicus de natura et gratia in materia de virtutibus. 4to. *Halæ.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Parriet** (Thos.) God's Election, &c. 4to. *Lond.*

1702. **King** (Will., *D.D.*) De Origine Mali. 4to. *Dub.*, and 8vo. *Lond.*

The London ed., pp. 214, Dedic. and Index; *Brem.*, 1704, 8vo or 12mo. In English, 3rd edit., *Lnd.*, 1731, 4to; 1732, 2 vols, 8vo; 3rd ed., *Camb.*, 1739, by Ed. Law, pp. iv, 517, 8vo, to which is added two Serm., on Divine Prescience, and the Fall of Man; 4th ed., *Dubl.*, 1758, 8vo; 1781, 8vo. This last is called the 5th ed., and is the best, having been revised by Bp. Edm. Law. It contains also the author's Serm. on the Fall of Man. King was Archbp. of Tuam, and his book has been much admired. Its great object was to combat the optimism of Leibnitz, and the Manicheism imputed to Bayle. Bayle attacks it in his "Réponse aux Questions d'un Provincial." Bayle's first criticism of the book was written before he had seen it, from a review in the Nouvelles de la Republiques des Lettres, for May and June, 1703. The Archbp.'s system, as explained by his editor Bp. Law, was afterwards adopted by Pope in his Essay on Man. The book was answered by Clarke (John), 1732, 8vo.

——— **Seldius** (J. Chr.) Orthodoxia divinæ æterno prædestinationis ex sede hujus articuli cardinale Ephes. i, 4—6 asserta. 4to. *Lips.*

——— **Burthogge** (R. J., *M.D.*) Christianity a revealed mystery. 12mo. *Lond.*

As to the author, see Bliss's Wood's Athen. Oxon., and Allibone, i, 305.

——— **Holtzfus** (Barth.) Tractatus Theologicus de Prædestinatione, Electione, Reprobatione hominum ad promovendam concordiam Ecclesiasticam conscriptus. 4to. *Franc. ad Viad.*

Another ed., same place, 1703, pp. 190, 4to; 1714, 4to.

Holtzfus was also author of a Disputation on the Fall of the first man.

1702. **Serry** (J. H.) L'histoire des Congregations de auxiliis justifiée contre l'auteur des *Questions importantes, &c.* pp. 522. 8vo. *Paris and Louvain.*

——— **Germon** (Barth.) Errata de l'histoire de la Congregation de Auxiliis composée par l'abbé Le Blanc, &c. pp. 364. 8vo. *Liege.*

——— **Lemos** (Thos. de) Acta omnia Congreg. ac disputationum quæ coram Clemente VIII. et Paulo V. sunt celebratæ in causa et controversia de auxiliis Divinæ Gratiæ. fol. *Lovanii.*

See Journal des Savans, 1702, Jul. 58; and Anthonii Biblio-Hispan., p. 335.

——— **Burnet** (Gilb.) Remarks on the Examination of the Exposition of the 17th Article.

——— **Launoy** (Jean de) [Marais] La véritable tradition de l'Eglise sur la prédestination et grâce. pp. 142. 12mo. *Liege.*

Also in vol 1 of Opera Omnia, 5 vols, fol., *Col.-Allob.*, 1731. In the 2nd vol, p. 302, will be found a tract "De auctore vero professionis fidei, quæ Pelagio, Hieronymo, Augustino tribui vulgo solet." According to Bossuet Launoy was both a semi-Pelagian and a Jansenist.

1703. **Palancus** (Fr.) Opera Theologica. 10 vols. fol. *Matriti.*

Vols 2 and 3—De Scientia futurorum contingentium, de Voluntate Dei, De Prædestinatione, De Providentia Dei concordata cum Humana libertate et Sanctitate Divina.

Another ed., same place, 1706, 2 vols.

"Vir Vitæ integerrimæ et miræ pœnitentiæ." —*Wadding*, see *Harter.*

——— Juste Discernement entre la créance catholique et les opinions de Protestans et autres touchant la Prédestination et la Grâce. 12mo. pp. 30.

——— **Calamy** (Edm., *D.D.*) Divine Mercy exalted, or Free Grace in its Glory, a Serm., on Rom. ix., 16. 16mo. *Lond.*

The author was a Minister of a nonconformist congregation, Blackfriars, Lond, 1692; one of the lecturers at Salter's Hall, 1702; and a Pastor of a congregation at Westminster, 1703, d. 1732.

——— **Spanheim** (Frederic) Opera. 3 vols. fol. *Lug. Bat.*

Vol 2, p. 1189, Disputationes Heidelbergenses de statu instituto primi hominis, &c.

——— **Young** (Edward, *LL.D.*) Serm. 2 vols. 12mo. *Lond.*

Vol 2, p. 89, 2 Sermons on Nature and Grace.

2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1706—03, 8vo. The 2nd vol is of the 1st ed. 3rd ed., *Lond.*, 1720, 2 vols, 8vo. The author was Dean of Salisbury. The two Sermons above were separately pub. *Lond.*, 1700, 4to.

——— **Taylor** (Nathaniel) Practical Discourses. 8vo. *Lond.*

Eight discourses on the covenant of grace, &c.

Taylor is called by Doddridge the dissenting South.

——— **Garcias** (Eusebius) de los Rios de libertate ad fidem, et de libertate ad meritum. *Compluti.*

1703. Theses Theologicæ de scientia, voluntate, providentia, prædestinatione, et gratia Dei. 4to. *Lovan.*

——— **Flavet** (Pet., *S.J.*) Theses theologicæ de gratia, præside P. P. F., propugnatæ in Universitate argentoratensi. 8vo.

——— Ordonnance de M. l'Archevêque de Reims, du 15 Octobre 1703, portant condamnation d'un libelle intitulé: Véritable tradition de l'Eglise, etc. 8vo. *Par.*

The book referred to was condemned by Pope Clement XI., 28th Jan., 1704, *Romæ*, 1704, 4to.

——— **Reineccius** (Chr.) Epitome universæ controversiæ de termino gratiæ peremptoris. 4to. *Lips.*

——— **Strimesius** (Sam.) Ingenua in Arminianismum inquisitio, semi-centuria annotationum in Spanhemii præcipuas cum Arminianis controversias, præmittitur ipse contextus Spanhemianus. 8vo. *Francof.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— Jansenismi in Hollandia. 12mo. *Trajecti.*

——— **Kruger.**—De peccato originali, mortali et veniali. 4to. *Kiel.*

——— **Grot** (J. J.) De providentia Dei circa minima. 4to. *Lips.*

——— **Bray** (Tho., *D.D.*) Lectures on the preliminary questions and answers of the Church Catechism on the doctrine of the Covenant of Grace. fol.

These lectures were so well received that 3000 proved not too great for the first impression. It was esteemed by many of the first distinction in the church, as the most accurate performance extant on that subject.

By the 1st and 2nd impressions he cleared upwards of £700.—*Dr. Kippis.*

This particular ed. does not seem to be in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Chapman** (Rich.) The Providence of God asserted, maintained, a Serm. 4to. *Lond.*

Scarce.

The author was vicar of Cheshunt.

1704. **Scherzer** (J. Ad.) Collegium anti-calvin, 40 disputationibus publ. excussum, ed. J. Schmid. 4to. *Lips.*

Also author of Colleg. Anti-Soc. See Disp., 28, 29, 30.

——— **Serry** (J. H.) Augustinus summus Prædestinationis et Gratiæ Doctor, a calumnia vindicatus, adversus Launoi. pp. 424, 8vo. *Colon.*

This work caused much discussion.

——— **Daniel** (Gabriel) Défense de S. Augustin contre un livre qui a paru depuis peu sous le nom de M. de Launoy, où l'on fait passer ce Saint Père pour un novateur sur la prédestination et sur la grâce. pp. 246, 12mo. *Par.*

Not in Brit. Mus.

The author was a Jesuit.

1704. [**Serry** (J. H.)] Le correcteur corrigé, suite de la Justification de l'Histoire des congrégations de Auxiliis. pp. 323, 12mo. *Paris* and *Namur.* 8vo.
See as to this controversy, Journal des Sçavans, May, 1702; and De Backer, voi 1, p. 335.

——— **Zeibich** (Christ. Hein.) De Prædestinatione et Reprobatione Infantium, disquisitio. 4to. *Witteb.*
Another ed., *same place*, 1709, 8vo.
Neither ed. in Brit. Mus.

——— **Brunnerus** (Christopher Andreas) Fatum Theologico-historicum. 8vo. *Lipsæ.*
Not in Brit. Mus.
See Arpe, 88, and Walch, i, 81.

——— **Offley** (Wm.) The Power and Providence of God considered and asserted, a sermon. 4to.

——— La devotion des predestinez. 12mo. *Paris.*

——— La distinction et la nature du bien et du mal, traité. 12mo. *Paris.*
Written against Manichæans, Montague, Charson, and Bayle. Bælius replied to this in his Histoire des ouvrages des savans, 1704, p. 369.

——— **Neumannus** (Jo. Geo.) Dissertatio de Huberianismo, falso nobis imputato. *Vitemb.*

——— **Edzardus** (Sebast.) Pelagianismus Calvinianorum. 4to. *Witteb.*
Another ed., *same place*, 1705.

1705. **Daniel** (Gab.) Lettre du P. D..... Jésuite, au T. R. P. Antoine Clocke, touchant le livre du P. Serry. pp. 39, 12mo. *Paris.*
The author was a Jesuit.

——— **Serry** (J. H.) Lettre du P. Serry au R. P. Daniel. pp. 69, 12mo. *Colon.*

——— **Daniel** (Gab.) Réponse du P. D. de la lettre que le P. P. Serry lui a écrite. pp. 57, 12mo. *Paris.*
Another Letter was also written same year, 12mo; see further as to the controversy, De Backer, i, 244.

——— ——— Traité théologique touchant l'efficacité de la grâce. pp. 218, 12mo. *Paris.*
A 2nd vol, *Paris*, 1706, pp. 418, 8vo.
The latter seems to be the only one in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Serry** (J. H.) Epistola Joannis Lannoii. pp. 24, 12mo. *In Campis Elysiis.*
On Predestination and Grace.

——— **Eleutherius** (Theod.) [Meyer (Livino de)] Historiæ Controversiarum de Divinæ Gratiæ auxiliis sub summis Pontificibus Sixto V., Clemente VIII., et Paulo V., libri VI. pp. lxiii and 818, fol. *Antverpiæ.*
This 1st ed. was pub. anonymously, and the author's name did not appear till the edition of 1742.
Other eds., *Brux*, 1715, pp. 448, fol.; *Venet*, 1742 and 1745, 2 vols, fol.
The author was a learned Jesuit, a theologian and poet, who much distinguished himself in his contentions with the Jansenists. He d. at Louvain, 1750.
See further, Walch, Bibl. Theol, ii., 987, 8.

1705. **Leydekker** (Jac.) Eere van de Nationale Synode, van Dordrecht in den jare, 1618 en 1619, voorgestaan en bevestiga tegen de beschuldingen van G. Brandt. 4 vols, 4to. *Amst.*
Another ed., *Amst.*, 1737, 4to.

——— **Witty** (John) The Mosaick History of the Creation and Fall. 2 vols, 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Luchesimiso** (Jo. Laur.) Jansenianorum hæresis Enchiridion. 8vo. *Romæ.*

——— **Gildon** (Chas.) The Deists' Manual. 8vo. *Lond.*
A part of this work is taken up in vindicating the attributes of God, his providence and government of the world.

——— **Diroysius** (Franc.) Dissertatio pro justificanda condemnatione qua Sancta sedes quinque propositiones sub nomine Jansensii atque in sensu ab ipso intento proscripsit. 4to. *Colon.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Dorrington** (Theophilus) Family instruction for the Church of England. 8vo. *Lond.*
P. 137, Providence represented.

——— **Fox** (Franc.) Serm. on the Superintendency of divine Providence. 4to. *Lond.*
The author was Vicar of Potterne, Wilts., and Preb. of Salisbury, Vicar of St. Mary's, Reading, 1726; d. 1738.

——— **Mackworth** (Sir Humphrey) A Discourse by way of dialogue, concerning Providence, the Wisdom of God in Redemption, etc. 2nd ed., 8vo. *Lond.*

——— [**Lallemant** (Jacq. Phil.)] Jansenius condemné par l'Église, par luy mesme, et ses defenseurs, et par S. Augustin. pp. 240, 12mo. *Brux.*
Another ed., *same place*, 1706, 8vo.
The author was a Jesuit, d. Paris, 1748. He was one of the most zealous defenders of the Constitution Unigenitus.
See Walch, Bibl. Theol. ii., 941, who attributes the work to Dumas.

——— **Edzardus** (Seb.) Manichæismus Calvinianorum. 4to. *Hamb.*

——— ——— De Cærimoniis in gratiam Calvinianorum haudquaquam mutandis. 4to. *Hamb.*

——— **Brandt** (Jo.) Verantwording vom de historie der reformatie van wülen zyn vader G. Brant tegens de beschuldigingen van Jacobus Leidekker. *Amst.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

1705. **Crondermus** (Lescius) Elucidatio Augustinianæ de divina gratia doctrinæ, quæ in libris Jansenii triplicem eclipsim passa est in triplici statu naturæ humanæ, innocentis, corruptæ et reparatæ. 4to. *Coloniæ.*

——— **Clarke** (Samuel, *D.D.*) The Being and Attributes of God.
Various editions: 2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1706, 8vo; 4th ed., *Lond.*, 1716, 8vo; 5th ed., *Lond.*, 1719, 2 vols, 8vo; 6th ed., *Lond.*, 1725, 8vo; 7th ed., *Lond.*, 1728, 8vo; 8th ed., *Lond.*, 1732, 8vo; 9th ed., *Lond.*, 1738, 8vo.
In French, *Amsterdam*, 1717, 2 tom, 8vo.
He endeavours to show that the Being of God may be demonstrated by arguments à priori, though he admits the arguments à posteriori to be by far the most generally useful. Bishop Hoadly considers that in this work Clarke, "laid the foundation of true religion too deep and strong to be shaken either by the superstition of some or the infidelity of others." That "He chose particularly to consider the arguings of Spinoza and Hobbes, the most plausible patrons of the System of Fate and Necessity; a system which, by destroying all true freedom of action in any intelligent being, at the same time destroys all that can be styled virtue or praiseworthy." Clarke was attacked by Bishop Law in his notes to Key's Essay on the Origin of Evil, but was defended in a work, *London*, 1732, 8vo, and in a second defence same year and place. Also vindicated by John Judison, *Lond.*, 1734, 8vo. This year were also published two pamphlets on the disputed points, one by Edm. Law, the other Joseph Clarke.
See 1717.

——— **Abelli** (Louis) Medulla theologica. 2 vols. 8vo. *Colon.*
A new ed., *Rat.*, 1839, 2 vols, which is in the B. M.
The author was Bp. of Rodez.

——— **Aickin** (Jos.) A Sermon upon conformity of the human will to the divine. 12mo. *Dublin.*

1706. **Hiero. de Sousa**: Scala Theologica per quam ascendit creatura de non esse ad esse et descendit a Deo in mundum. access. tractatus de Prædestinatione ac etiam futurorum contingentium polysophia. *Matr.*

——— **Wyck** (Adr. van) De Prædestinatione divinâ, acced. de reprobatione tractatus. 8vo. *Colon.*
Very rare.

——— **Reginaldus** (Ant.) De Mente Concilii Tridentini circa Gratiam se ipsa efficacem. fol. *Antv.*
See Walch, Bibl. Theol. i. 182.
"Il s'y montre un des plus ardents défenseurs de la doctrine, qu'il regarde comme celle de Saint Thomas et de Saint Augustin."—*Feller.*

——— **Affelmannus** (Jo.) Syllogism. Anti-Calvinistic., quo evincitur, non esse eumdem orthodoxorum et calvinianorum Deum, &c. 4to. S.L.

——— **Torres** (Ildef. de) Selecta Theologia de Peccato et Gratia, Decem Disputationes ex Gravioribus et Subtilioribus continens. *Compluti.*

1706. **Hussey** (Jos.)) Glory of Christ unveil'd, or the excellency of Christ vindicated, &c. 4to.
The Author was a Congregational Calvinist divine of Cambridge.
See Wilson's Hist. of Dissenting Churches.

——— **Serry** (J. H.) Schola Thomistica Vindicata. pp. 287. 8vo. *Colon.*
On the Efficacy of Divine Grace.

——— **Elis** (Edmund) Animadversiones in aliqua C. Jansenii, G. Twisse, R. Baxteri et G. de Vries, dogmata, quæ doctrinæ evangelicæ de benevolentiâ divina hominibus per Christum exhibita advertantur. pp. 33. 8vo. *Lond.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Heroldus** (Adam) Palladium Reformatum destructum, id est, doctrina de absoluta Dei gratia, vel decreto, ex cap. ix. epistol. ad Roman. subruta et eversa. 4to. *Lips.*

——— Relation de ce qui s'ést passé dans l'affaire de la paix de l'eglise sous le pape Clement IX. 2 vols. 12mo. *Roterd.*

——— [**Serry** (J. H.)] Confutatio responsi epistolaris a Gabriele Daniele ad primarii academiæ patavinæ theologi litteras dati, qua singula ejusdem responsi capita continuata serie refelluntur. 8vo. *Colon.*

——— **Zieroldus** (Joh. Guil.) Synopsis veritatis divinæ, opposita synopsi controversiarum, calumniarum et errorum Samuelis Schelgerigii. 8vo. *Francof.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Oldfield** (F.) Mille Testes: against Atheists, Deists, and Scepticks testifying to..... 3. Divine Providence. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— [**Lallemant** (Jac. Phil.) Le véritable esprit des nouveaux disciples de S. Augustin. 3 vols. 8vo. *Brux.*
Another ed. same place, 1707, 4to.

[1706.] **Bernard** (Jonathan) God's Providence the support of Government. A Sermon. 4to. *Lond.*

1706. **Gervasius** (Brisac.) Cursus theologicus. 6 tom. in 3 vols. *Colon.*
Contains—De Scientia et voluntate Dei.

1707. **England** (John) View of Arminianism, compared with moderate Calvinism. pp. 237. 8vo. *Lond.*
Very rare.
Have only met with one copy.

——— **Loescherus** (Val. Ernest.) De Paroxyismis absoluti decreti. *Vitemb.*

——— **W.** (J.) The Glorious works of creation and providence. A Poem. 4to. *Lond.*

——— Disp. Theol. de providentia Dei, sub præsid. Er. Hanssen. 4to. *Upsal.*

1707. Tres dissertat. de Deo, attributis ac decretis divinis, præside Barth. Holzpus. 4to. *Francof.*

——— **Wolf** (Johann Christian) Manichæismus ante Manichæos, et in Christianismo redivivus. 8vo. *Hamburgi.*

——— **Hussey** (Jos.) God's operations of Grace, but no offers of grace. 8vo. *Lond.*

A Congregational Calvinist divine of Cambridge.

An abridged ed., *Lond.*, 1851, 8vo, pp. 164.

This is a very poor performance.

1707—8—25—26. **Edwards** (John, *D.D.*) Veritas Redux, or Evangelical Truths restored. 3 vols. fol. and 8vo. *Lond.*

Takes the opposite view to Whitly.

Dr. Edwards has been called the Paul, the Augustin, the Bradwardine, the Calvin of his age. His great work was his "Theologia Reformata," pub. in 1713, fol., 2 vols, *Lond.*

1707. [**Du Vaucel** (Lud. Paul.)] Animadversiones in Nodum Prædestinationis Cardinalis Sfondrati dissolutum. 4to. pp. 248. *Colon. Agrip.*

See Jour. des Sçavans for Aug. 27, 1708.

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Gœtzius** (Geo. Hen.) Acta Huberiana. 4to. *Lubecæ.*

——— [**Meyer** (Lievin de)] De mente S. Concilii Tridentini circa gratiam physice prædeterminantem Dissertatio prima, contra librum qui sub nomine Antonii Reginaldi nuper prodiit. Auctore Liberio Gratiano Theologo. pp. 191. 8vo. *Antv.*

A 2nd ed., 1709, 8vo; and a second Dissertation followed in 1708, *Brux.*, 8vo; reprinted in 1709 at same place; and a 3rd Dissertation in 1708, *Brux.*, 8vo.

——— **Griffith** (John) Two Discourses: 1. God's Oracle and Christ's Doctrine, or, the six principles of Christian Religion. 2. A treatise touching falling from grace. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Soeffingius** (Justus) Betrachtung des menschlichen lebenziels. 8vo. *Rudolstadt.*

——— **Zentgravius** (Jo. Joach) Præfatio apologetica contra Petrum Yuonem. [Affixed to ed. of Luther's "De servo arbitrio.] 4to. *Argent.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Foertschius** (Mich.) Disputatio de œconomia catholicismi gratiæ ad gentiles sub veteri testamento pertinente. *Jenæ.*

——— **Clericus** (J.) Défense de la providence contre les Manichéens. 8vo. *Roter.*

Against Bayle.

The work is composed on the principles of Origen. Le Clerc also undertook the defence of Cudworth's System, especially of his hypothesis of *Plastic Natures*; the discussion produced a multitude of writings on both sides, and finally led Le Clerc to accuse Bayle of Atheism, an accusation which has ever since stuck to the poor man. The charge may not be true, but though the great philosopher's contributions to the dissemination of knowledge were worthy of all praise, still it must be acknowledged they have been most baneful in the propagation of an unsettled spirit of free thinking.

1707. **Placette** (De la) Réponse à deux objections qu' on oppose de la part de la raison a ce que la foi nous apprend sur l'origine du mal et sur le mystère de la trinité. 12mo. *Amst.*

With an appendix concerning predestination.

——— The Covenants of Redemption and Grace display'd, *etc.* 4to.

1708. Le Jansénisme abatu. 8vo. *Liege.*

——— **Atkinson** (John) Discourse of Election. 8vo. *Lond.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— [**Fouilloux**] La Chimère du Jansénisme. 12mo. [*Brussels.*]

Assigned to Quesnel (P.) in the Brit. Mus. Cat.

——— Gratia Christi, seu causa Dei ab Augustino defensa seu Mallæus magnus magni et Aurelii Augustini, plenissimè conterens Liberium Antigratianum, ac totam Molinianam cohortem minimè liberam, quia oppugnat veram gratiam quâ homo verè fit liber. Oblatus summo Pontifici Clementi XI., à Petro Gratiano. pp. 158, 12mo.

——— Controversiæ inter defensores libertatis et prædicatores gratiæ. 4to. *Leodii.*

——— **Ramirez** (Vinc.) Tractatus de Scientia Dei. 2 vols, fol. *Matriti.*

"Magno studio idem pro scientia Dei media pugnat."—*Walch.*

——— **Hildebertus Turonensis.**—Opera. Labore et studio D. Antoni Beaugendre. fol. *Paris.*

P. 766, De Adæ peccato, nostraque inde captivitate.

P. 1009, Tractatus theologicus, de peccato primi hominis, &c.

The author was Bishop of Mans and afterwards Archbp. of Tours. He died in 1132.

——— **Gonzales de Leon** (Jo.) Controversiæ inter defensores libertatis et prædicatores gratiæ, de auxiliis Divinæ gratiæ. 4to. *Leodii.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **D'Elbecque** (Norb.) Dissolutio schematis Wyckiani de prædestinatione. 12mo. *Antv.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

An appendix was published in the following year, *Antv.*, 8vo.

——— [**Petit-fried** (N.)] Vana religio, Obedientiæ credulæ, seu silentium religiosum in causâ Jansenii. 2 vols, 12mo.

1708. **Brandt** (Ger.) Historie van de Rechtspleging (1618—19) outrent de Heeren Joh. van Oldenbarnevelt, Rombout Hoogerbeets, Hugo de Groot.
4to. *Rott.*
This ed. not in Brit. Mus., but there is one *Rotterdam.* 1721, 4to.

——— **Kirsch** (Peter) Deus movens ex mente S. Thomæ Doctoris Angelici absque Prædeterminatione Physica.
pp. 158, 12mo. *Coloniæ.*
The author was a Jesuit Prof. of theology at Trèves.
Other eds., *Confluentiæ,* 1709, 12mo, pp. 360; *Coloniæ Agrip.*, 1711, 12mo.

——— **Knippenberg** (Sebastian) Deus movens juxta mentem D. Thomæ, seu Responsio ad libellum P. Kirschii.
12mo. *Colon. Agrip.*

——— **Schmidt** (Jo. Andr.) Disputatio de Samuel. Huberi vita, fatis ac doctrina. *Helmst.*

——— **Naudæus** (Philip) La Souveraine perfection de Dieu dans les divins attributes et la parfaite integrité de l' écriture prise au sens des anciens reformez. 2 vols, 8vo. *Amst.*
The 1st vol is against Bayle and his view of the origin of evil, and Jaquelot's *Examen theologiæ Bœlianæ.*
The 2nd is a defence of supralapsarianism.
For a description of the views of the author see Walch, ii., 1024.

——— Lettre à M..... sur le traité de la souveraine perfection de Dieu. 12mo.

——— **D'Aubigne** (C. M.) Mandement de Mgr. l'Eveque de Noyon sur les institutions théologiques du P. Juenin, &c. 4to.

——— Dialogi pacifici inter Theologum et Juris-consultum, contra libellum: De quæstione facti Jansenii variæ quæstiones, &c., aliasque anonymus.
8vo. *Brux.*

——— Lettre d'un Docteur de Sorbonne à un homme de qualité, touchant les heresies du dix-septieme siècle.
12mo. *Par.*

[1708.] **Dransfeld** (Justus a) Programma, quo ad audiendam...orationem de Providentia Dei circa Hebræas Græcasque, literas, paria expertas fata..... C. Münden.....omnium ordinum viri eximii et literati quique Gottinge, viventes...invitantur. 4to. [*Gottingen.*]

1709. **Van Wavre** (Phil.) Corn. Jansenii Iprensis Episcopi Augustinus Europæus perperam dictus, in ferali famosarum suarum Pentade per Augustinum verum Max. Eccles. doctorem triumphatus, damnatus, priusquam natus, atque Apostolico fulmine ictus. Accedit Digressio contra Jansenianorum principium avitum academicum, Vincentium Palæophilum, etc.
8vo. *Antv.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

1709. [**Meyer** (Liev. de)] De Pelagianorum et Massiliensium contra fidem erroribus Dissertatio IV. qua Jansenii et aliorum in hac materia errata referuntur et confutantur auctore Liberio Gratiano theologo.
pp. 214 and 94, 8vo. *Brux.*
Another ed. appeared in 1710 at *same place,* 8vo.

——— **Basnage de Beauval** (Jacques) Sermons sur divers sujets de morale, de théologie, et de l'histoire sainte, *&c.*
3 vols, 8vo. *Rotterdam.*
Vol 1, L'assurance du salut.

——— **La Touch** (Peter) A Preservative against atheism and infidelity, in 3 books.—1. Proving the existence of a God, a providence, &c.
2nd ed., 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Zeidlerus** (Melch.) Dissertatio de peccato actuali infantium, ob petantiam et raritatem ejus correctior edita.
Helmst.

——— **Gormaz** (Jean Baptiste) Cursus Theologicus— Vol. 1. Complectens tractatus de Deo.....de Divina Gratia, etc. pp. 803—812, 2 vols, fol.
Aug. Vind.

——— **Gratianus** (Liber) Dissertationes de mente S. Concilii Tridentini circa gratiam physicè prædeterminantem. De mente Augustini circa gratiam physice prædeterminantem. De Pelagianorum et Massiliensium contra fidem erroribus. 8vo. *Antv.*

——— **Ignace** (Hen. de S.) Ethica amoris, sive Theologia Sanctorum.
As to this work see De Backer VII., 310, condemned at Rome by decree, 15 Sept., 1714.

——— **Jenks** (Rich.) A Vindication of the Doctrine of Predestination.
8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Owen** (John) Gospel Grounds and Evidences of the Faith of God's Elect. 12mo. *Lond.*

——— Recueil des objections, qui ont été faites jusqu' à present contre le traité de la souveraine perfection de Dieu. 12mo. *Amst.*

——— **Placette** (Jo. de la) Eclaircissement sur quelques difficultés, qui naissent de le consideration de la liberté necessaire pour agir moralement, etc.
12mo. *Amst.*
Also the same year the author of a work on the same subject—"Réponse à une objection," 8vo.
Both works were examined by Naudæus in a work published, *Amst.*, 1713.

1709. **King** (Will., *D.D.*) Divine Predestination and Foreknowledge consistent with the Freedom of Man's Will. 8vo. *Dubl.*

Other eds., *Lond.*, 1710, 8vo; *Exeter*, 1815, 8vo; and with notes by Archbp. Whately, *Oxf.* and *Lond.*, 1821, pp. 126, 8vo. Also in Tracts of Angl. Fathers, ii., 225.

In the above Serm., in vindicating human liberty as being not overruled or affected by the moral attributes of the Deity, King started a doctrine concerning the disparity of those attributes with the moral qualities of the same name in man, which has called down upon him much criticism. Anthony Collins attacked him in his Vindication of the Divine Attributes, 1710, as did also Dr. John Edwards in a tract the same year, *Lond.*, 8vo, see too p. 135.

——— **Turner** (John, *D.D.*) The wisdom of God in the Redemption of Man, as delivered in Holy Scripture. 8vo. *Lond.*

A 2nd vol 1739, fol.

——— **Ben-Israel** (Menasseh) Of the Term of Life, viz.: Whether it is fix'd or alterable: with the sense of the Jewish Doctors, both ancient and modern, touching Prædestination and Freewill. Transl. into Engl. by Thos. Pocock, Rector of Danbury in Essex, and Chaplain to the Duke of Bedford. pp. xxiv., 117, 8vo. *Lond.*

Very rare indeed, have only met with three copies, two of which are in the writer's possession.

——— **Fearon** (J.) A reply to Atkinson's pretended answer to Absolute predestination not Scriptural. 8vo.

1710. **Lintrupius** (Sev.) Anglia plurimis modis Lutheranizans, sive de Contemtu Concilii Dordraceni in Angliâ. 4to. *Hafn.*

——— **Hottingerus** (Jo. Jac.) Diatribe historica theologica, qua Prædestinationem et Godeschalci Pseudohæreses Adversariorum Gratiæ commenta esse demonstratur. 4to. *Tiguri.*

——— The Perseverance or Defectability of the Saints, with some Reflections on the State of the Heathens, the Providence and Prescience of God. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Collins** (Anthony) A Vindication of the divine attributes in some remarks on the Abp. of Dublin's [King] Sermon, entitled Divine Predestination, etc. 8vo. *Lond.*

The author shows that according to Archbp. King's notions, it is impossible to prove the existence of God against atheists.

——— **Edwards** (John) The divine perfections vindicated; or, more brief remarks on [Archbp. King on Predestination]. 8vo. *Lond.*

1710. **Marolles** (Louis de) Discours sur la providence. 12mo. *Amst.*

A translation in English by John Martin, *Lond.*, 1790 and 1801, 8vo.

——— **Hoenicke** (Mathias) Mellificium theologicum de peccatis et gratia. 4to. *Bambergæ.*

The author was a Jesuit teacher of theology at Mayence, Wurzbourg, Heidelberg, and Bamberg, and died in 1724.

——— **Bardesanes.**—De Fato. 4to. *Witteb.*

Ed. of 1824, 8vo, only in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Raye** (Nicolas) Theses Theologicæ de Peccatis et Gratia, cum Responsione ad appendicem Miscellaneam, etc., Præside R. P. N. R., *S.J.*, Def. P. Joannes Feytens, *S.J.* pp. 24, 4to. *Antverp.*

——— **Olearius** (J.) Synopses Controversiarum selectiorum cum hodiernis pontificiis Calvinianis Socinistis Remonstrantibus, etc. pp. 836, 8vo. *Lips.*

The author was a Prof. of Theology at Leipsic. The above is a work of great research and particularly valuable in connection with German writers.

——— **Wagner** (Bernard) De gratiosa Dei vocatione. *Argent.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— Fatum fatuum. 8vo. *Amst.*

Another ed., *Alton*, 1730, 8vo.

——— **Whitby** (Dan., *D.D.*) Absolute Election and its dependent doctrines, examined and disproved; being a summary of Whitby on the Five Points. 8vo. *Caermarthen.*

——— ——— Sermons (33) On the Attributes of God. 2 vols, 8vo. *Lond.*

Whitby was a celebrated Arminian divine, Preb. of Salisbury, 1668, and Chanter of the Cathedral, 1672; Rector of St. Edmund's Ch. in Salisbury, 1673, and Preb. of Taunton Regis, 1696 and 1726, aged 88. His works are replete with judicious argumentation, sound sense, and extensive learning.

——— ——— Four discourses on Election and Reprobation, Foreknowledge, etc. 8vo. *Lond.*

Other eds., *Oxf.*, 1735, 8vo; 1816, 4th ed., *Lond.*, 1817, pp. 466, 8vo.

Dr. Jortin was of opinion that in this work 'Calvinism is confuted even to a demonstration;' on the other hand Dr. Ed. Williams pronounces it 'a bold effort to overthrow the leading doctrines of the protestant reformers by learned obscurity, artful sophistry, and a disgusting tautology.' Whitby's work is undoubtedly the ablest work which has ever appeared in the Arminian interest, the only work to compare with it is Tomline's 'Refutation of Calvinism,' which, however, is vastly inferior in learning to the above book. Dr. Whitby has unfortunately introduced into his book—specially in those parts which treat of original sin and the operations of the Holy Spirit—observations which on the most favourable construction are distinctly semi-Pelagian.

——— ——— The extent of Christ's redemption. 8vo. *Lond.*

Not in Brit. Mus.

1710. **Strimesius** (Sam.) Systema gratiæ divinæ. 4to. *Francof. ad Oder.*
Another ed., *same place*, 1712, 4to.
Neither in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Stevens** (Henry Robert) Dissertatio theologica de condemnatione libri Janseniani. pp. 56, 8vo. *Leodii.*
Not in the B. M.

——— **Graudin** (Marb.) Opera Theologica. *Paris.*
De Divina Gratia.

——— **Brown** (Gulielmus) *Resp.* Disputatio de decretorum et præscientiæ Divinæ æternitate vera, *Præs.* J. A. Marck. 4to. *Lugd. Bat.*

——— **Beare** (Nic.) The government of the World in God's hands, &c. A Serm. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Leibnitz** (Guil. Bar. de) Essais de Theodicée sur la Bonté de Dieu, la liberté de l'Homme, et l'origine du Mal. 2 vols. pp. 660. 8vo. *Amst.*
Another ed., *Amst.*, 1712, 1714, 1720, 1748 (Latin) *Colon.*, 1716, 8vo; *Amst.*, 1747, 2 vols, pp. 498, 410, (Latin), *Francof.*, 1719, 2 vols, 8vo; 1739, 3 vols, (Latin), *Aufl.*, 1753, 8vo; *Tub.*, 1771, 2 vols, 8vo; *Berl.*, 1840, 2 vols, 8vo. In German, *Hanov*, 1720. The author was the great philosopher. See Principes de la nature et de la grace fondée en Raison, par M. le Baron de Leibnitz; dans l'Europe Savante, 1718, Nov. Art. VI. Also "Various Writings on occasion of the Dispute between Platner and Wezel respecting the Thèodicée of Leibnitz," *Lips.*, 1782, 8vo. Jon. Kant über das Misslingen aller Philos. Versuche einer Théodicée in seinen kleinen Schriften, 3 B. Betrachtingen über den optimismus, *Koningsb.*, 1759, 4to. Robinet in his book on Nature has published a System analogous to that of Leibnitz, *Amst.*, 1761—68, 5 vols, 8vo.

——— **Kromayerus** (Hier.) Scrutinium religionum tum falsarum, tum unice veræ, cui accesserunt præter quinque Disput. detectio et proscriptio variorum nostro tempore Syncretismorum e J. C. Danhanero. *Lips.*
Disp. XI, pt. i. and ii. (Freewill.)

——— **Marin** (Jo.) Tractatus de Scientia Dei.
2 vols. pp. 532, 402. 12mo. *Compluti.*

——— **Blackwell** (Thos.) Schema Sacrum. 4to. *Edinb.*
Other ed., *Paisley* [1728], 8vo; *Dublin*, 1753, 8vo, pp. 338. The author was Prof. of Greek in the Univ. of Aberdeen, 1723. The 1st layman ever Principal of the Marischal Coll. in Aberdeen, since the patronage came to the Crown by the forfeiture of the Marischal family in 1716. He d. in 1728. The above work deals with Predestination as comprehending the whole great events relative to Angels and Men with respect to time and eternity; also with the Divine permission of the Fall of Man. The author was a Calvinist. There is much of value in the book.

1711. **Prosper** (*Saint, of Aquitaine*) Opera Omnia. fol. *Par.*
p. 1., S. Prosperi epistola ad Augustinum de reliquis Pelagianæ hæreseos in Gallia subolescentibus.
p. 14, Hilarii epistola ad Augustinum de eodem argumento.
p. 23, St. Augustini de prædestinatione sanctorum, liber primus.
p. 51, St. Augustini de dono perseverantiæ, liber secundus.
p. 87, S. Prosperi ad Rufinum epistola de gratia et libero arbitrio.
p. 255, S. Cælestini papæ pro Prospero et Hilario, seu pro ipso Augustino de gratia Dei epistola.
p. 263, Sedis Apostolicæ auctoritates de gratia et libero arbitrio, &c.
Prosper was also the author of a work on Divine Providence. See 1524.

1711. **Ekinger** (George Jacob) Dissertatio sufficientem Aquaram copiam tanquam Argumentum Divinæ Providentiæ exponens. 4to.
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Seneca** (Lucius Annæus) De Providentia liber ad Lucilium a Jo. Henr. Ackero cum Not. Var. 8vo. *Rudolst.*

——— De Deo uno, attributis, visione, scientia Dei, prædestinatione, &c. 4to. *Antv.*

——— Instruction familière sur la prédestination et sur la grâce par demandes et par réponses. 8vo. *Liege.*

——— **Marin** (John) Tractatus de Voluntate. *Matriti.*
The author was a Jesuit, Confessor of Prince Louis Philippe, afterwards King of Spain, and d. at Madrid, 1725.

——— ——— Tractatus de Prædestinatione. 12mo. pp. 498. *Matriti.*

——— **Saur** (Georges) Theses theologicæ de peccatis et gratia. 4to. *Bambergæ.*
The author was a Jesuit, teacher of philosophy and theology at Bamberg and Wurtzbourg, being also Chancellor of the University at the former.

——— De inconcussa SS. Augustini et Thomæ doctrina, irrefragabili auctoritate, in materia præsertim de gratia, ad theses de argumento in proximis comitiis provincialibus propugnandas, positiones prolusoriæ, quas Præside F. Norberlo D'Elbecque Ord. Præd. S. Th. Doctore, &c. 8vo. pp. 80 and 48. *Louv.*

——— **Whitby** (Dan., *D.D.*) Tractatus de Imputatione Divina Peccati Adami posteris ejus universis in Reatum. 8vo. *Lond.*
This work occasioned considerable controversy. In it the author denies that the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity has any fair ground in Scripture. He wrote the treatise about the year 1690, but did not publish it till 1711. It is reviewed in Le Clerc, Bibl. Anc. et Mod. IX., 281, and was translated into English by Tho. Heywood in 1739. It was repub. with notes by J. S. Semler, *Halæ*, 1775, 8vo.

——— **Edwards** (John, *D.D.*) The Arminian doctrines condemn'd by the Holy Scriptures, by many of the fathers, &c., in answer to Daniel Whitby. 8vo. *Lond.*

1711. **Edwards** (Jonathan, *D.D.*) The Doctrine of Original Sin. 8vo. *Oxf.*
This is against Dr. Whitby. The author was Princ. of Jesus Coll., in 1686. He d. 1712.

——— **Albanus** (Ægidius) Augustinus Yprensis vindicatus: atque à damnatione Romanorum Pontificum, Urbani VIII, Innocentii X, Alexandri VII, et Clementis XI ereptus et erutus.
p. 516. 4to.

——— **Bellelli** (Fulg.) Mens Sancti Augustini de Statu creaturæ rationalis ante peccatum.
pp. 520. 8vo. *Lucernæ.*
A valuable work.
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Rawbone** (Thos.) The Path to Liberty, or the Method of Man's Redemption. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Hoadly** (Benj., *D.D.*) Several discourses concerning the terms of Acceptance with God. 8vo. *Lond.*
A 4th ed., *Lond.*, 1734, 8vo. The author was Bishop of Bangor, 1715, of Hereford, 1721, of Salisbury, 1723, and of Winchester, 1734. Styled by Burnet a "pious and judicious divine."

——— **Anderson** (David) Dissertatio Theologica inauguralis de Peccato Originali. pp. 16. 4to. *Abredeis.*
The author was Prof. of Theology in King's Coll., Aberdeen.

——— Vindiciæ gratiæ divinæ adversus novantiquos ejus impugnatores, ad mentem gemini ecclesiæ solis SS. Aur. Augustini et Thomæ Aquinatis, &c., Præside F. Norb. D'Elberque, Def. F. Huburtus van Meerendonck.
8vo. pp. 120. *Brux.*

——— **Pfaffius** (Christ.) De imputatione divina lapsus Adæ. *Tub.*

——— Freye und freywillige replic auf die so titulierte abgenöthigte antwort eines zeitlichen ministerii in der evangelisch reformirten gemeine zu Wesel, &c. 4to. *Hamb.*
Another ed., same place, 1712, 8vo.

——— **Luchesinus** (Jo. Laurentius) Historia polemica Jansenismi.
3 vols. 8vo. *Romæ.*

——— **Albanus** (Ægidius) [De Witte] Augustinus Yprensis vindicatus.
4to. *S.L.*
Not apparently in B. M.

——— Six lettres d'un Docteur de Sorbonne à un homme de qualité, touchant les heresies du dix-septieme siècle.
Paris.
See 1708.

——— **Grove** (Ralph) Every Christian's capacity of being saved, asserted from Scripture, in opposition to the Doctrine of absolute Election. *Bristol.*

——— **Boehme** (Anton. Wilhelm) The doctrine of Original Sin. A Serm.
8vo. *Lond.*

1711. **Viva** (D.) Damnatæ theses ab Alexandro VII, Innocentio XI, et Alexandro VIII, Acc. Quesnellianæ theses.
2 vols. 4to. *Patavii et Beneventi.*
This seems to have been the 3rd ed. The 2nd having been *Patav.*, 1709, 4to. See De Backer iii, p. 1435, No. 1; another ed., 4 parts in 1 vol, *Patav.*, 1715, 4to, which is not mentioned by De Backer. Other ed., *Patav.*, 1717, 2 vols, 4to: *Ferrariæ*, 1765, 2 vols, 4to. See De Backer iii, p. 1438.
The author was a Jesuit.

1712. Extracten getrokken nit den nationalen Synode, gehouden tot Dordrecht raakende de Catechisatien.
4to. *Dord.*

——— **Jagerus** (Jo. Wolf.) Sfondrati Nodum prædestinationis examinatum.
Tub.

——— **More** (Alex.) De Gratia et Libero Arbitrio. *Hamb.*

——— **Gordon** (Fran.) An Essay upon Predestination and Grace wherein the honour of God is defended, and the free will of man maintained. *Edin.*

——— **Heyendal** (Nic.) Defensio scriptorum theologicorum de gratia Christi.
pp. vii, 161. 4to. *Lovanii.*

——— **[Petitfried** (N.)] de l'Injuste Accusation de Jansénisme. 12mo. *S.L.*
The author in 1728, wrote a letter to one of his friends on the refugees in Holland, and on the prospects of the Jansenists, 4to.

——— **Arpe** (Pet. Frider.) Theatrum Fati, sive Notitia scriptorum de Providentia Fortuna et Fato.
pp. 101. 8vo. *Roterd.*
"*Liber rarissimus.*"
This book is historical only, not irreligious; what Arpe had to say *de Providentia et Fortuna* was reserved for other works, but I know not whether such works ever appeared."—*Dr. Parr.*
The work is one of considerable research, but very incomplete in the light of modern investigation. A 2nd ed., *Roter.*, 1716, 8vo.

——— **Whitby** (Dan.) A Full Answer to Dr. Jon. Edwards's Arguments for the opinion of St. Augustin concerning the Imputation of the First sin of Adam for guilt to his Posterity. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Henneguier** (Hier.) Epistolæ quatuor. ad Larvatum Liberium Gratianum.....super Dissertatione prima ipsius de mente Concilii Tridentini circa gratiam physice prædeterminantem. 8vo. *Antv.*

——— **Tilly** (William, *D.D.*) 16 Sermons preached before the University of Oxford at St. Mary's, upon several occasions. 8vo. *Lond.*
p. 226, Two Sermons on the grace of God shewn to be not only consistent with the liberty of man's will, but the strongest obligation to our own endeavours.
The author was Rector of Albury.

1712. **Hopkins** (E.) Doctrine of the two covenants. 8vo. *Lond.*
(*Original Sin.*)
Another ed., revised by Josiah Pratt, *Lond.*, 1809, 8vo. The author was Bishop of Raphoe, and of Derry, see 1809.

——— **Sendall** (George) Victory of Grace over Sin and Death. 18mo. *Lond.*

1713. **Viva** (Dom.) Theologica trutina damnatorum thesium. 4to. *Patavii.*
Another ed., same place, 1715. Neither of these ed., in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Fogg** (L.) God's grace in Election vindicated. 8vo.

——— **Palacopolitanus** (Fran.) [More, Henry] Divine Dialogues concerning the attributes of God and His Providence in the World. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Day** (Will.) Man's destruction proved to be of himself; in which, the Antinomian and Arminian errors are confuted. 12mo. *Lond.*

——— Passchier de Fyne, Eenige tractaetjes, waarbij gevoegt zijn D. Tilenus van de oorzaek en oorsprong der zonden; J. Uitenbogaert, over Cap. IX. des Briefs tot den Romeinen, euz., zedruk, vermeerd. met zijn leven. 8vo. *Rotterd.*

——— **Yool** (Robert) Nature and Extent of the Covenant of Grace. 58 pp. *Newcastle.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Naude** (Ph.) Examen de deux traittez par M. La Placette, &c., avec une addition où l'on examine le dogme de la Prémotion Physique, &c. 2 vols. 12mo. *Amsterd.*

——— **Zemlenzi** (Franciscus) Disputatio .....de libero hominis peccatoris arbitrio, *Præs.* R. Andala, 4to. *Franequeræ.*

——— **Berkeley** (George) Three dialogues. 8vo. *Lond.*
The author was the ingenious Bishop of Cloyne in Ireland. His treatises mostly bear on the subjects under consideration. Treatise on the Principles of Human Knowledge, *Lond.* and *Dub.*, 1710, 8vo. 2nd ed., 1725; *Lond.*, 1734, 8vo; 1878, 8vo. Three dialogues between Hylas and Philonous, *Lond.*, 1713, 8vo; 1725, 8vo. Alciphron, or the Minute Philosopher, *Lond.*, 1732, 2 vols, 8vo; 1734, 2 vols, 8vo; *New Haven* (*U. S.*), 1803, 8vo. Theory of Vision, *Lond.* and *Dub.*, 1709, 8vo; *Edin.*, 1872, 8vo; Vindicated and Explained, *Lond.*, 1860, 8vo. See remarks on the Minute Philosopher [by John Lord Hervey], *Lond.*, 1732, 8vo. 3rd ed., *Lond.*, 1732, 8vo; Review of the Theory of Vision, by Bailey (S.) 1842, 8vo. Berkeley's Works collected, *Lond.*, 1784, 2 vols, 8vo; *Lond.*, 1843, 2 vols 8vo; *Oxf.*, 1871, 4 vols, 8vo.

——— **Wyck** (Adr. van) De Voluntate Dei ad salvandos omnes homines, et de morte Christi pro omnibus hominibus. 8vo. *Colon. Agr.*

1713. **Marin** (Jo.) Tractatus de libero arbitrio. 2nd ed. *Matriti.*

——— **Andala** (Ruard.) Disp. de libero hominis peccatoris arbitrio. 8vo. *Franequeræ.*
Very rare. Not in the Brit. Mus.
The above work is separately paged and attached to the author's "Vindiciæ Veritatis, quam Ecclesiæ Reformatæ profitentur," pp. 128.

——— **Delaune** (Will., *D.D.*) On original sin. A Serm. 8vo. *Lond.*
2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1713, 8vo; 3rd ed., *Lond.*, 1722, 8vo; 4th ed., *Lond.*, 1725, 8vo.
Republished with others, *Lond.*, 1728, 8vo. The author was Pres. of St. John's Coll., and Margaret Prof. of Divinity at Oxford.

1714. Introduction pastorale de M. l'Archevêque de Cambray, du premier Janvier 1714 en forme de dialogues, sur les matières de la grâce. 3 vols. 8vo. *Cambray*

——— Exposition historique de toutes les hérésies et des erreurs que l'Eglise à condamnées sur les matières de la grâce et du libre arbitre. 12mo. *Paris.*

——— Histoire de l'Etat de l'homme dans le Péché originel. 8vo.
A copy of this work was in the collection of the Duc de la Valliere.

——— **Dupin** (Lewis Ellis) Nouvelle Bibliothèque des auteurs ecclesiastiques, etc. 43 vols. 8vo.
Vol. 30 in vol. 1 of XVII Century "Propositions touchant la prédestination, la grâce," etc.
The author was the well known Doctor of the Sorbonne, and Prof. of Divinity at Paris, d. 1719.

——— **Fiddes** (Rich., *D.D.*) Practical discourses on several subjects. 3 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*
Vol. 2. 2nd ed., p. 227. The true notion of predestination.
p. 327. God in the government of the world wills by particular rules.
The author was Rector of Halsham about 1694, and through illness loosing his power of speech, turned his attention to authorship. An ingenious but prolix writer.

——— Three Sermons: 1. Eph. 2. 5. The Grace of God in the rise, progress, and completion of it, or, that the Christian's salvation is all of grace, &c., by S. A. 8vo. *Salop.*

——— **Stinton** (Benjamin) Serm. on Divine Providence. 8vo. *Lond.*
A Bapist minster in London.

——— Réfutation d'un livre intitulé, De l'Action de Dieu sur les créatures. 12mo. *Paris.*

——— **Schrœerus** (Georg. F.) De viribus peccato primo amissis. *Vitemb.*

——— **Buddeas** (Jo. Franc.) Dissert. de Pelagianismo, in ecclesia romana..... triumphante. *Jenæ.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.
Also in his Miscellanea Sacra, *Jenæ*, 1727, 4to, part ii. p. i.
See 1727.

1714. Theologische gedancken über den entwurf der lehre von der beschaffenheit und ordnung der gœttlichen rathschlüsse. 4to.

——— **Jansenius**, Vere auctor quinque famosarum propositionum et Quesnelli consensus. S. Augustinus contrarius, &c. 8vo. *Lucæ.*

——— **Allut** (Jean) Plan de la justice de Dieu sur la terre. 8vo.
Same year also in Latin.

——— **Morel.** Theses de actibus humanis, de peccato, etc.

1715. **Dorge de la Passion** (La Père) Le discipline pacifique de Saint Augustin, sur la liberté, la grace, et la prédestination, avec deux dissertations préliminaries. 4to. *Par.*
Another ed., *Rennes*, 1729, 2 vols, 4to.

——— **Arnauld**, Ecrits sur le Système de la Grace générale. 2 vols. 12mo.

——— **Sierret** (Ralph, *D.D.*) The great duty and happiness of waiting for God in the way of his providence.

——— **Topping** (Henry) The certainty of an overruling Providence on, Psalm xxii, 28. 8vo.

——— **Freke** (Thomas) An essay upon the liberty of the will and human actions. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Meyer** (Liv. de) Responsio ad librum F. Henerici a S. Ignatio cui titulus gratiæ per se efficacis sive Augustinianæ Thomisticæ adversus injustam Jansenismi accusationem justa defensio ubi etiam theologia Sanctor moralium adversus injustos detractores defenditur. 8vo. pp. 362. *Brux.*

——— **Eyre** (Richard) The necessity of Grace, with our Reason in Christian Faith. 8vo. *Oxf.*

——— **Barry** (James) The doctrine of particular Election (before time) asserted and proved by God's Word. pp. 104. 8vo.
(Calvinistic.)
2nd ed. revised by W. Huntington, *Lond.*, 1802, pp. 104, 8vo. 3rd ed., *Lond.*, 1814, 8vo.

——— **[Nicole** (Peter)] Traité de la Grace générale. 2 vols. 12mo. S.L.

——— **Leng** (John) Knowledge of the Nature and Providence of God. 4to.
The author was bishop of Norwich, 1723.

——— **Spener** (Ph. J., *D.D.*) De Naturâ, et gratia. 8vo. *Francof.*
A German ed., *Franck.*, 1687, 12mo; *Berl.*, 1733; and *Franck.*, 1733.
The author was minister at Franckfort, 1666, and afterwards at Dresden, 1686, and finally at Berlin.

——— **Gramlichius** (Jo. Andr.) Tract. theoretico-practicus de fœderibus divinis. 8vo. *Lug. Bat.*

1715. **Malebranche** (Nic.) Reflexions sur la prémotion physique. 8vo. *Paris.*
This was the last work of Malebranche.

——— Historiæ controversiarum de divinæ gratiæ auxiliis, ab objectionibus Hyacinthi Serry vindicatæ, libros tres. fol. *Brux.*

——— **Gengell** (Geo.) Jansenismi doctrina tribus exposita tractatibus. 4to. *Brunsbergii.*

——— **Collins** (Anthony) Philosophical Inquiry concerning Human Liberty and Necessity. 8vo. *Lond.*
Other ed. same place, 1717, 8vo; and 1734, 8vo, Transl. into French and printed in the Recueil de Pièces sur la Philosophie, etc., *Amst.*, 1720, 2 vols, 12mo; *Birmingham*, 1790, 8vo, pp, 80, preface by Dr. Priestley. The ed. of 1715 not in the Brit. Mus.
The author was educated at Eton and King's Coll., Camb. He was a freethinker and confuted by Dr. Clarke, see 1717, and 1760. Collins did not think the Doctor had the advantage in the dispute, yet as he had represented Collin's opinions as dangerous in their consequences, and improper to be insisted upon, he found after such insinuations he could not proceed in the dispute upon equal terms. Collins also wrote a Vindication of the Divine Attributes, 1710, 8vo.

1716. **Cordeyro** (P. Ant.) In præcipua partium D. Thomæ Theologia Scholastica expositore. De Divina Gratia. *Ulyssip.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Wishart** (W., *D.D.*) Theologia, or Discourses of God delivered in CXX. Sermons. 2 vols. 8vo. *Edinb.*
"Wishart has much that is valuable."—*Bickersteth.*
He was Princ. of the Coll. of Edinburgh.
Another ed., *Paisley*, 1787, 2 vols, 8vo. See Wilson (W., *D.D.*) The Attributes of God, 1835, 8vo.

——— **Hertzig** (Franc.) Catonius Cornelii Jansenii Sprensis Episcopi S. Scripturæ, Pontificibus, Conciliis et SS. Patribus præprimis Augustino e diametro oppositus. 12mo. *Wratislaviæ.*

——— **Adams** (Will.) 15 Discourses occasionally delivered before the Univ. of Oxford. 8vo. *Lond.*
p. 407. The state of man before the Fall. p. 435. The state of man after the Fall.

——— **Vejelius** (Elias) De reliquiis Pelagianismi, in papatu latitantibus. 4to.

1717—1724. **Fontana** (Jac.) Clementis XI. Constitutio Unigenitus Theologicæ Propugnata, cum synopsis. 4 vols. fol. *Romæ.*
"Singulas seorsim vel plures Propositiones affines simul expendit, omni Theologicorum Argumentorum genere refellit et quicquid Jansenianorum sagacitate excogitatum numquam facit in propositionem favorem, accurate discutit, ut ita damnationis aequitatem demonstret."—*Hurter.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

1717. **Renversement** de la Doctrine de S Augustin sur la Grace, par l'instruction Pastorale de M. M. les Evêques de Luçon, et de la Rochelle.
pp. 732. 12mo.

——— **Clarke** (Sam., *D.D.*) A Vindication of Mankind, or Freewill Asserted, in answer to a book entitled a Philosophical enquiry concerning Human Liberty by Anthony Collins.
8vo. *Lond.*

Clarke had been called upon to defend the Newtonian philosophy against Leibnitz who had represented it to the Princess of Wales, afterwards the wife of George II, as false in philosophy and dangerous in theology. Sir Isaac Newton took up the mathematical line of defence, leaving the philosophical branch to Dr. Clarke. His discussion with Leibnitz respecting philosophical liberty and necessity was succeeded on the death of Leibnitz by a similar controversy with Collins. His chief glory, as has been remarked by Dugald Stewart, is due to the boldness and ability with which he placed himself in the breach against the Necessarians and Fatalists of his times.

——— **Chubb** (Tho.) Two Inquiries, one of them concerning Papists in which is considered Liberty of Conscience: and the other concerning Sin, wherin is considered Original Sin. 8vo. *Lond.*

The author was a literary tallow chandler. He is usually classed among the Deistical writers, but perhaps not justly. He had great natural ability but no learning, and usually attempted more than his qualifications enabled him to accomplish.

——— **Trellundus** (Jo.) Diss. de Luthero, doctrinæ absoluti decreti suspicione multis et manifestis evangelicæ ipsius doctrinæ testimoniis absoluto.
Hafn.

——— **Pfafflus** (Christ. Matt.) Specimen historiæ dogmaticæ in articulo de gratia et prædestinatione. 4to. *Tub.*

——— Storia e Sentimento dell' abbate Tosini sopra il giansenismo nelle presenti circostanze della chiesa, alla santita di N. S. papa Clemente XI.
3 vols, 12mo. S.L.

——— **Stuart** (Will, *D.D.*) Of Divine Grace. A Serm. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— [**Quesnel** (P.)] Des Hexaples, ou lès six colonnes sur la constitution Unigenitus. pp. 396. *Amst.*

The authors are:—L. T. Boursier, Jacq. Le Fèvre, Jacq. Fouillon, Pasq. Quesnel, J. B. Le Scéné des Ménilles, d'Ettemarre, G. N. Nivelle.
See Barbier ii, 626.

1718. Reflections on Predestination.

——— **Feyteus** (Joannes) Theses theologicæ de Peccatis et Gratia quas Præside R. P. Joanne Feyteo, S. J., S. Theologicæ Professore, defendunt P. Franciscus Fernande P. Joannes van Rysingen, P. Lambertus Bormaus ejusdem Societatis. 4to. *Lovanii.*

1718. **Buddeus** (Jo. Franc.) De anima, sede peccati originalis principali.
Jenæ.

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— Dissertation sur ce mot de Saint Augustin: *Causa finita est;* où on examine quelle étoit la force de cet argument contre les Pélagiens, etc. 8vo.

——— **Van-Rant** (P. François) Veritas in medio. *Anvers.*

Not in Brit. Mus.

[1718.] **Wagner** (Geo. Sam.) De natura libertatis humanæ.....disputabunt G. S. W.....et J. J. Dornfield.
4to. *Lipsiæ.*

1718. Vindication of the Doctrine of Grace. 12mo. *Edinb.*

1719. **Mather** (Cotton) Mirabilia Dei; or an Essay on the Interpositions of divine Providence to relieve distressed objects. 12mo. *Boston, U.S.*

——— **Mascareli** (Vincent) Tractatus Theologicus, dogmaticus et Canonicus de Libertate actus Divinæ Fidei, ex quo Quadraginta trium Quesnelli propositionum justa deducitur damnatio, ad mentem Clementis XI., Pont. Max. in Constitutione Unigenitus Dei Filius.
fol. *Salm.*

——— **Clarke** (John, *D.D.*) Enquiry into the cause and origin of evil.
8vo. *Lond.*

This ed. not in Brit. Mus.
Various other ed. Another *Lond.*, 1721, 8vo. An ed. in Dutch by Jo. Sudermann, *Roterd.*, 1723, 8vo.
The author was Dean of Sarum, Chaplain to the King. He d. 1759. Clarke does not hesitate to make self love the principle of virtue.

——— **Heinius** (Sam. Gottlieb.) Singularitas providentiæ divinæ; oder sonderbare merckmalen göttlicher vorsorge vor der menschen leben und wohlfahrt.
8vo. *Dresd.*

——— **Marolles** (Louis de) Essais sur la providence et sur la possibilité physique de la resurrection, traduit de l'anglois du Dr. B. 12mo. *La Hage.*

——— [**Barcos, Mart. de**] Instruction sur la doctrine de la grace et de la prédestination. 12mo. *Brux.*

——— **Hennebel** (J. L.) Opuscula [Theses Septem, sub præside Hennebel historico-theologica doctrina Lovanensium de Gratia.] 8vo. *Lovanii.*

——— **Bosses** (Barth des) Godefridi Guillelmi Leibnitii Tentamina Theodicææ de bonitate Dei, libertate hominis, et origine mali, latine versa, et notationibus illustrata a M. D. L.
12mo. pp. 108. *Franc.*

Not in the B. M.

——— **Frickius** (Jo.) Zosimus in Clemente XI redivivus. 4to. *Ullmæ.*

1719. Le Système entier de Jansénius et des Jansénistes renouvellé par Quesnel dans ses Réflexions Morales.
4to. S. L.

——— **Goad** (Thomas) A Disputation concerning the Nature and contingency of events in respect of God's eternal decrees—see Col. of Tracts below.
Camb.

(Arminian.)

——— **Schlotterbeck** (G. F.) De Origine Mali et de Imputatione Peccati primi. 4to. *Tubingæ.*

——— **Freke** (T.) On the Liberty of the Will and Grace. 8vo.

——— A Collection of Tracts concerning Predestination, Providence, and the other Points depending on them.
pp. 392. 8vo. *Camb.*

"The performance is elaborate, subtle, and scholastic, and the author shews himself to be a man of study and reading."—*Dr. John Edwards.*

The work is not difficult to obtain, and Plaifere's appeal which opens the vol. is particularly valuable.

——— **Zeltnerus** (Gust. Geo.) Breviarium controversiarum cum Remonstrantibus. pp. xxii, 533. 8vo.
Noribergæ et Altorf.

This ed. not in the Brit. Mus.
Another ed. *Lipsiæ*, 1724, 8vo.
An excellent manual "tyronibus in controversiis."—see Walch, ii. 533.

——— **Colliber** (Sam.) The Christian Religion founded on Reason—with some particular considerations on the doctrines of the Trinity, the Fall, the Resurrection and Eternal Punishment.
8vo. *Lond.*

This 1st edition not in the Brit. Mus.
2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1729, 8vo; 3rd ed., 1735, 8vo.
Also author of "Enquiry into the existence and nature of God," *Lond.*, 1718, 8vo; 1735, 8vo; "The Known God," *Lond.*, 1737, 8vo.

1720. **Archelaus** (Saint, Bp. of Caschara) Disputatio adversus Manichæum—See Eusebius. Vol. 2. fol.

Another ed., Valois (H. de) Vol 2, 1746, fol.

——— **Pfaffius** (Christ. Mat.) Disputat. de imputatione peccati primi. *Tab.*

Adv. Petr, Boelium.

——— **Treviranus** (Lud. Geo.) Rühm der glaubigen von dem todt Jesu.
4to. *Brem.*

——— **Hermann** (Cœlest) Theologia Selecta Scotistica—De Gratia, Justificatione et Merito. *Aug. Vind.*

——— [**Broüe** (Pierre de la)] Defense de la Grace efficace par elle même.
12mo. *Paris.*

Not in the Brit Mus.
Another edition, 1721, same place and size.

1720. **Davies** (Tho.) The faith and practice of a Christian explain'd and enforced. In sixteen discourses.
8vo. *Lond.*

P. 41. The Providence of God asserted in the permission of moral evil from the instance of Joseph. The author was Rector of Little Hallingbury, Essex.

——— **Saurin** (James) Discours historiques, critiques, théologiques, et Moraux, sur les événements les plus mémorables du Vieux et Nouveau Testament.
11 vols. 8vo. *Amst.*

Vol 1. Chapter on Condition of Fallen Man. Translated into Eng., *Lond.*, 1720, 8vo; 1723, fol.
In his sermons on divers texts, new ed., 12 vols, *Haye*, 1749, 8vo, vol 2, p. 1, there is a sermon on assurance, Rom. viii, 38-39. Other ed. of these sermons, *La Haye*, 1721, 1722, 1724, and 1725, 5 vols, 8vo.
The author was a minister of the French Protestant Church at the Hague, where he d. 1730. The particular portion referred to is not of any value.

——— **Fancourt** (Sam.) An Essay concerning Certainty and Infallibility.
8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Clarke** (J.) Enquiry into the cause and origin of Moral evil.
8vo. *Ebend.*

Another ed., *Lond.*, 1721, 8vo. This and his treatise of 1719 were in answer to Bayle and other defenders of Manichæan principles. Trans. into Dutch by Sudermann, Roter., 1723, 8vo, and into Germ.

——— **Ringier** (Jo. Henr.) Diss. de consensu protestantium in doctrina de prædestinatione. 4to. *Bernæ.*

——— **Melvill** (Thos.) Divine Grace.
8vo.

Another ed., 1730, 8vo.

——— **Ford** (R.) Ecclesia Anglicana Articuli xxxix. *Lond.*

Contains a little on the 17th Article, and at end an account of the Lambeth Articles.

1721. **Mayr** (Ant.) Augustinus Doctor Gratiæ et Libertatis theologice propugnatus. pp. 118. *Ingolst.*

A Jesuit, who d. 1749.

——— **Wade** (Geo.) The Providence of God in the Plagues of Mankind. A Serm. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— [**Du Vau** (L. F.)] Analyse à l'Augustin de Jansenius, où l'on expose toutes ses erreurs. pp. 880. 4to.
[*Par.*]

Not in the Brit. Mus. Under Du Vau. Another ed., *Par.*, 1723, 4to.

——— Instruction familière sur la Prédestination et sur la Grace, par demandes et par résponses. *Liege.*

——— **Hadow** (Jas.) The Antinomianism of the Marrow of Modern Divinity detected. 12mo. *Edinb.*

——— **Saunders** (Erasmus, *D.D.*) Of Judicial Providence, an Assize Sermon, on Ps. lviii, 11. 8vo.

The author was vicar of Bluckley.

1721—9. **Pez** (Bernard) Thesaurus anecdotorum novissimus.

Vol 2, part 1, p. 237, Honorii Augustodun. libellus de libero arbitrio. See 1552.

Vol 3, part 2, p. 251, Othloni Monachi Epistola de permissionis bonorum et malorum causis.

Othlo was a Benedictine Monk.

Vol 4, part 2, p. 111, Algeri seu Adelgeri, monachi chuciacensis, libellus de libero arbitrio. Alger died about 1152.

——— **Edzard** (Esdr. Henr.) Christlutherische lehre von der gnadenwahl. 4to. *Hamb.*

——— **Grimmius** (Jos.) Zusammenfassung der lehre von der ewigen erwehlung. 8vo. *Bern.*

——— **Edzard** (Esdr. Henr.) Der spiegel des bœsen geistes der sich in der hœchst œrgerlichen predigt Trevirani reget. 4to. *Hamb.*

1722. **Colonia** (Dom. de) Bibliothèque Janséniste, ou Catalogue alphabétique des libres Jansénistes, Quesnellistes, Baianistes, ou suspects de ces erreurs. 12mo. *Lyon.*

This ed. not in the Brit. Mus.

A 2nd ed. appeared *Lyon*, 1731, 12mo. Another in 1752, 12mo; 1735, S.L., 8vo, pp. 488 and 14 and another at *Brussells*, 2 vols, 1744, 8vo.

——— **Kraus** (Joh.) Antwort auf die Frage wessen Vrsachen halber der meiste Haufe der Menschen zur Hölle fahre. 12mo. *Prag.*

——— **Pien** (Ignace) Theses theologicæ de Gratia, Justificatione, Merito, Peccatis, quas Præside R. P. Ignatio Pien, S.J., Sacræ Theologiæ Professore def. P. Joannes Baptista Velle, P. Joannes Ferrari ejusdem Soc. 4to. *Lovanii.*

——— **Trellundus** (Jo.) Lutheri wahre meinung von der allgemeinen gnade Gottes. *Jenæ.*

Another ed. same place, 1727, 8vo.

——— **Pletho** (Georg.) Libellus de Fato. 8vo. *Lug.-Bat.*

——— **Wynne** (Thos.) The evidences of an over ruling Providence in defeating the conspiracies of cunning and ungodly men. A serm. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— Exposition de la doctrine de S. Augustin et de S. Thomas sur la grace efficace, par M. De.....Abbé de... .. *Verdun.*

"Ce dangereux et pernicieux livre," said the Bishop of Marseilles, in 1725, "est l'exposition par Demandes et par Résponses, non de la respectable Doctrine du grand S. Augustin, et du Docteur Angélique S. Thomas, sur la Grace de J. C., mais véritablement de la détestable doctrine de Luther de Calvin, de Baius, de Jansénius, et de leur trop fidéle disciple Quesuel; desquels les erreurs sur la Grace si souvent frappées des anathémes de l'Eglise, sont renouvellées sans pudeur, et enseignées sans déquisement presque à chaque page de ce livre, comme des vérités incontestables et faussement attributées à deux des plus brillantes lumieres de l'Eglise."- *Dict. Liv. Jansen.*

1722. **[De Lorraine]** Mandement de M. de Bayeux, contenant le jugement qu' il porte sur différentes Propositions qui lui avoient été dénoncées par le P. De Genes Jésuite.

——— [———] Autre Mandement portant approbation et confirmation de la censure de la Faculté de Théologie de Caën du 31 Décembre 1720, contre dix-sept Propositions, tirées tant les Cahiers que des Thèses publiques des Jésuites du Collège de Caën. Pp. 114.

Neither apparently in B. M.

M. de Lorraine, Bishop of Bayeux, died at Paris 19 June 1728. He was one of the 12 bishops who signed the letter against the Council of Embrun, The "Mandement" was prescribed at Rome 14 July 1723 as, "contenant quelques opinions et doctrines téméraires, suspectes, injurieuses au Liége Apostolique et favorisant des erreurs condamnées."—*Dict. Liv. Jansenists.*

——— **Blackmore** (Sir Rich., *M.D.*) Redemption; a divine poem in VI. books. 8vo. *Lond.*

1723. **Superville** (Daniel de) Sermons sur divers textes. 5 vols. 8vo. *Rortterd.*

Vol 1, p. 333, Les profondeurs de la providence; p. 383, La gloire de la première innocence, en la malheur de la chute de l'homme, &c. Vol 2, page 145, La Source de dons de la grace. The 1st ed., seems to have been *Rotterdam*, 1700—01—05, in 3 tom, 8vo. A trans. by John Reynolds, *York*, 1812, 8vo; and by John Allen, *Lond.*, 1816, 8vo. Another ed., *Norwich*, 1816, 2 vols, 8vo.

——— Remarques en forme de Dissertations sur les Propositions condamnées par la Bulle Unigenitus, etc. 2 vols. 4to. *S.L.*

——— A Dissertation in answer to a blasphemous Letter concerning the fall of man and the Coming of Christ. 8vo.

——— **Roulle** (Pierre Jul.) Examen du poëme de la grace en trois lettres. 8vo. *Brux.*

The 2nd letter only is by Roullé, the other two are by Brumoy and Hougnant. Roullé was a Jesuit.

——— **Stanhope** (Michael, *D.D.*) The Prosperity of the wicked and the sufferings of the righteous not inconsistent with the Goodness and Justice of Providence. 4to.

The author was Preb. of St. Paul's, 1711, and Canon of Windsor, 1730.

——— **Abbadie** (Jacques) Le triomphe de la Providence et de la Religion. 4 vols. 12mo. *Amst.*

This is in reality a commentary on the Apocalypse, "one of the boldest commentaries that ever was published," says Dr. Kippis. He admits "there are in it abundance of surprising things, and the strongest proofs that the fire of the author's imagination was not at all damped by his years."

——— **Billingsley** (John) Sermons against Popery. 8vo. *Lond.*

P. 313, Of assurance.

1723. **Pez** (Bernard) Thesaurus anecdotorum novissimus. 6 vols. fol. *Aug. Vind.*

Vol. 4, pt. 2, Engelberti abbatis Admontensis tractus de libero arbitrio.

Engelbert was a Benedictine, who died at an advanced age in 1331. He was Abbot of Anmont in Syria, and wrote a treatise also on Divine Providence.—See Arpe, Theatrum Fati, 44. See 1721.

——— **Wenzl** (Alphonsus) Controversiæ selectæ, ex universa theologia scholastica, ad mentem doctoris angelici, D. Thomæ Aquinatis, et accuratam scholæ angelicæ methodum concinnatæ. 4 vols. fol. *Ratisbonæ.*

Vol 3, De Gratia.

——— **Cyprianus** (Ernest Salomo) Das urtheil hodiberümter englischen theologen von der synode zu Dordrecht und ihrer lehre. *Goth.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Hoffmannus** (God.) Dissert. contra errores pontificiorum circa doctrinam de peccato originali. *Tub.*

——— **Goudin** (Lemovic.) Tractatus Theologici posthumi juxta D. Thomam Ag. 2 vols. 8vo. *Colon.*

1. De Scientiâ et voluntate Dei, Providentiâ, Prædestinatione, Reprobatione.
2. De Gratia.

——— **Davye** (Thos.) A Discourse of the Covenant of Grace. pp. viii. 85. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Montalbanus** (Salv.) Opus theologicum. 3 vols. fol. *Panormi.*

Vol 1. De peccato originali et ejus debito.

1724. **Brandt** (Casp.) Historia vitæ Jac. Arminii. 8vo. *Amst.*

An ed. by Mosheim, *Brunsvigæ*, 1725, 8vo. In Eng., *London*, *Glasgow* [*printed*], 1854, 8vo.

——— **Halesius** (J.) Historia Concilii Dordraceni. ex Angl. verit. et observat. auxit J. L. Moshemius. 8vo. *Hamb.*

——— **Turrettinus** (Jo. Alph.) Disputationes apologeticæ pro veritate religionis Christianæ. Dissertatio de providentia Dei, et vindiciæ providentiæ divinæ. 4to. *Genevæ.*

Turretin was a minister of Geneva; b. 1671, d. 1733, he was an able writer, and one of the first to lay the foundation of the Socinianism and Infidelity which has so long prevailed in the region of Geneva.

——— **Serry** (Jac. Hyac.) D. Augustinus, D. Thomæ ejusque angelicæ scholæ secundis curis conciliatus in quæstione de gratia primi hominis et Angelorum. 2nd ed. pp. 256. 8vo. *Patavii.*

An able work.

——— **Calmet** (Aug.) Commentaire littéral sur tous les livres de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament. 8 vols. *Par.*

Vol. 8. Dissert. La prédestination et la reprobation des l'homme. The 1st ed. seems to have been in 1715, 4to. Other ed., 1767, 4to; 1820, 8vo; 1827, 8vo and 4to; 1834, 4to.

1724. **Bulfinger** (Geo. Bern.) De origine et permissione mali præcipue moralis. pp. 504. 8vo. *Francofurti et Lipsiæ.*

A philosophical work.

Other ed., *Tub.*, 1743, and *Franc. et Lipsiæ*, 1774, 8vo.

——— **Clarke** (Sam.) 17 Sermons on several occasions. 8vo. *Lond.*

p. 279—The original of sin and misery.
p. 329—Election and reprobation.

——— **Pez** (Bernard) Bibliotheca ascetica antiquo-nova, hoc est: Collectio veterum quorundam et recentiorum opusculorum asceticorum, quæ hucusque in variis MSS. codicibus et bibliothecis delituerunt. 12 vols. 8vo. *Ratisb.*

Vol. 6. Ven. Engelberti abbatis admontensis, tractatus de providentia Dei.

——— **Martene** (Edmund) Veterum scriptorum et monumentorum historicorum, dogmaticorum, moralium, amplissima collectio. 9 vols. fol. *Paris.*

Vol. 9, p. 1075. Harmonia, sive tractatus de libero arbitrio et gratia, auctore Viviano Præmonstrantensi.

——— **Chesne** (Jean, Baptiste P. du) Le Prédestinationisme, ou les hérésies sur la prédestination et la réprobation où l'on expose la naissance, les progrès, les revolutions, les dogmes et les sectes diverses des Prédestinatiens. 4to. pp. 477. *Paris.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

A Jesuit, see Journ. des Savans, May and Sept., 1725, and De Backer ii, 119.

——— **Wolff** (Ch.) De differentia nexus sapientis et fatalis necessitatis, &c. 4to. *Halæ Magdeb* [*urgicæ*].

There seems to have been an ed. in 1723. Another ed., same place, 1737, 4to. The author was a Prof. of mathematics at Halle in 1707, and was driven from his chair in 1723, when he retired to Marburg, where he taught as Prof. of Moral Philosophy. He was honourably recalled to Halle 1740 by Frederic II., and d. there, 1754. He is chiefly distinguished for the accuracy of his scientific method as applied to practical philosophy.

——— **Lisseus** (Gust.) Defens. pro theologis evangelicis seculi reformationis, sigillatim pro Luthero, &c. 4to.

1725. **Ridgley** (T.) The Doctrine of Original Sin considered. Two Sermons. 8vo. *Lond*

——— **Talbot** (Will., *D.D.*) Twelve Sermons. 8vo. *Lond.*

p. 39—A Vindication of Providence. The author was Dean of Worcester, 1691; Bp. of Oxford, 1699; of Worcester, 1715; and of Durham, 1722. He d. 1730.

——— **Thompson** (Thos.) The glorious truth of Universal grace and atonement exalted, in a treatise concerning Election and Reprobation, necessity and freedom, and the Divine prescience, &c. 8vo. *Lond.*

Also author of "Universal Grace and Atonement," 1753.

1725, **Veneer** (John) An exposition of the 39 Articles. 8vo. *Lond.*
The 17th article. Other ed., 1734, 8vo; *Lond.*, 1830, 8vo, 2 vols.

——— A Letter to Dr. S. Clarke concerning the difficulty of reconciling Prescience and Freewill. 8vo.

——— **Derling** (Johann. Gottlieb.) *Resp.* Dissertatio.....de anima, sede peccati originalis principali—*Præs.* J. F. Buddeo. 2nd ed. 4to. *Jenæ.*

——— **Nasmith** (Robert) Covenant of Grace. 8vo.

——— **Turrettinus** (Jo. Alphon.) Opusculis variis generis. 8vo. *Brus.*
Vol. 1, p. 426—Oratio variis Christianæ doctrinæ fatis.

——— **Jay** (Gabr. Franc. le) Bibliotheca Rhetorum.
2 vols. pp. xiv, 804; x, 898. 4to. *Paris.*
Vol. 1, p. 376—De Perseverantiâ Christianâ; p. 399—De Presentiâ Divinâ. The author was a Jesuit, and Prof. of Rhetoric in Paris.

——— **Jackson** (John) Defence of Human Liberty. 8vo. *Lond.*
The author was a learned Arian divine, Rector of Rossington, 1710, Master of Wigston's Hospital, 1729, d. 1763.

——— **Tourneley** (H.) Medulla theologiæ Tournelianæ, sive prælect. theolog. de gratia Avisti. 8vo. *Paris.*
Another ed., *Colon.*, 1735.

——— **Honert** (J. v. d.) Diss. de gratia Dei non universali, sed particulari, nec non de essentia et existentia Dei. 8vo. *Lug. Bat.*

——— **Wollaston** (W.) Examination of the notions of moral good and evil. 8vo. *Lond.*
This work was criticised by John Clarke, Master of the Grammar School, in Hull, 1725, 8vo.

——— **Taylor** (Richard) Discourses (10) on the Fall and Misery of Man, and on the Covenant of Grace. 2 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*
The author was a dissenting minister of a Meeting House, New Fish Street, Lond., about 1717. "Evangelical."—*Bickersteth.*
"A radiant champion for the faith."—*Nesbitt.*

——— **Shute** (John, Lord Barrington) An Essay on the several dispensations of God to mankind. 8vo. *Lond.*
"Much valuable information may be derived from this work."—*Quarterly Review.*

1726. **Bosses** (Barth. des) Annotationes aliquot unius e Societate Jesu Theologi ad excerpta quædam ex assertionibus P. Pii Schölling, ordinis Prædicatorum. 12mo. *Colon.*
Not in Brit. Mus.
Contre une thèse soutenue le 18 Juillet de cette année. Les remarques du P. des Bosses concernent l'Election efficace des Prédestines.—*De Backer*, Bibl. des Ecrivains de la Comp. de Jésus.

1726. **Vitus** (Steph.) Apologia, in qua Synodus Dordracena et reformata fides ab criminationibus Mosheimii cum aliis vindicatur. 8vo. *Casselis.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Collier** (Jeremy) God not the origin of Evil. 8vo. *Lond.*
The author was the celebrated nonjuring Bishop. He was educated at Caius College, Cambridge, and was for some time Rector of Ampton, near Bury St. Edmunds. In 1685 he become lecturer at Gray's Inn.

——— Parallel of the Doctrine of the Pagans with the Doctrine of the Jesuits, and that of the Constitution Unigenitus issued by Pope Clement XI. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— La confession de Foy des Eglises Reformées des Pais-Bas. 4to. *Amst.*

——— **Slater** (J.) Conditions of the Covenant of Grace explained. 12mo.

——— **Bird** (Ed.) Fate and Destiny inconsistent with Christianity, or the horrible decrees of absolute and unconditional election and reprobation fully detected; in eight conferences between Epenetus and Eutychus. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Burnet** (Thos., *D.D.*) Boyle Lect 2 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*
Vol. 1—Cause and effect, God's government, providence, Fall of man, etc. The author was Rector of West Kingston, and Preb. of Sarum. He was educated at New Coll., Oxford.

——— **Wernsdorfius** (Gottl.) De absoluto prædestinationis et electionis decreto, veræ consolationis impatienti. *Vitemb.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Hunt** (John) The Doctrine of God's Eternal Decrees stated: and His righteousness therein cleared and vindicated. pp. 208. 8vo. *Norwich.*
To the work are added Animadversions on a book just published intitled Fate and Destiny inconsistent with Christianity. The author was a minister at Northampton. Another ed., *Glasg.*, 1791, 8vo; and there seems to have been an earlier ed., *Norwich*, 1724, 8vo.

——— **Parker** (Henry, *M.A.*) The Wisdom of Providence vindicated.

——— **Chubb** (Thos.) An examination of Mr. Barclay's principles with regard to Man's natural ability since the fall. pp. 99. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— ——— A Vindication of God's moral character; as to the cause and origin of evil, both natural and moral. In a letter to a friend. pp. 80. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Beaven** (Thos.) Supernatural influences necessary to salvation. 8vo. *Lond.*
In support of the 4th proposition of Barclay's Apology and in reply to Chubb's examination, above

1726. **Edwards** (John, *D.D.*) Theologia reformata. fol. *Lond.*
p. 357, Perseverance. The first ed. of this work was *Lond.*, 1713, 2 vols, fol., which is the only ed. in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Sande** (Franc. de) Candidatus Eborensis ad Lauream Theologicam instructus. fol. *Eboræ.*
(Grace and Predestination.)

——— **Wavraus** (Jos. de) Theses Theologicæ de Gratia et Peccatis quas præside R. P. Josepho de Wavraus Jesu Sacræ Theologiæ Professore, &c. 4to. *Lovanii.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Pfaffius** (Chr. Mat.) Vindiciæ dictorum novi testamenti de gratiæ divinæ universalitate. *Tub.*

——— **Draes** (Ant.) Confutatio Vitilitigationum, quibus Stephanus Vitus evangelicam doctrinam de sacra cœna oppugnare ausus est. Accedunt vindiciæ formulæ concordiæ in articulo de prædestinatione adversus ejusdem Stephani Viti cavillationes. 8vo.
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Snitling** (Dan.) Beweis, dass des groben Calvinisten zu Bremen Lud. Geo. Treviraus so genannte vertheidigung die herrlichkeit der gœttlichen gnade verunglimpfe, &c. 4to.

——— **Mosheim** (J. L.) Onderzoek van het gezag du Dordretchtsche Synode om aantetoonen dat dit den Kerkelijken vrede hinderlijk is. 8vo. *Amst.*

——— **Chubb** (Thos.) A Supplement to his Vindication of God's moral character. pp. 48. 8vo. *Lond.*

1727. **Turrettinus** (Jo. Alph.) Nubes testium pro moderato et pacifico de rebus theologicis judicio et instituenda inter protestantes concordia. *Rostoch.*

——— **Hottingerus** (Jo. Jac.) Fata Doctrinæ de Prædestinatione et Gratia Dei Salutari.
pp. 502 and 518, and Index. 4to. *Tiguri.*
A valuable work.

——— **Pfaffius** (Chr. Mat.) Dilucidationes de Libero Hominis Arbitrio. 4to. *Tub.*

——— ——— Vindiciæ Dictorum veteris et novi testamenti de Peccato Originali. 4to. *Tub.*

——— Explication du Mystère de la passion de N. S. Jesus-Christ, suivant la Concorde. 12mo. *Amsterdam*

——— **Buddeus** (John Franc.) Miscellanea sacra. 2 vols. 4to. *Jenæ.*
Vol. 1, De Pelagianismo in Ecclesia Romana, etc. (see 1714).
Vol. 2, De origine mali, etc. (See 1718).

——— **Tapoltsany** (Laurent.) Theses theologicæ de Peccatis, Gratia et merito. 8vo. *Tyrnaviæ.*

1727. **Szdellar** (Francis) Conclusiones Theologicæ de Peccatis Gratia et Merito. 8vo. *Tyrnaviæ.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.
The author was a Jesuit teacher of philosophy and theology. He was chancellor of the University of Tyrnaw, and died in 1745.

——— **Hochstetter** (Jo. Frid.) Schediasma philosophico theologicum. *Amst.*
See as to this Walch i, 256.

——— **Kromayer** (Aug. Jod.) Dissertatio de divina contingentium præscientia. *Jenæ.*

——— **Allen** (James) Discourse on Providence.
The author was first Minister of Brookline, Mass., America.
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Clark** (Hugh) Meditations upon the love of Christ in the redemption of Elect sinners. [In verse.] 4to. [*London.*]
Another ed., *Glasgow*, 1777, 8vo.

1728. **Cattenburgh** (Adrian von) Bibliotheca Scriptorum Remonstrantium. 8vo. *Amst.*

——— **Young** (Edward, *LL.D.*) Vindication of Providence. 4to. *Lond.*
2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1728, 8vo; 3rd ed., *Lond.*, 1729, 8vo; 4th ed., *Lond.*, 1737, 8vo. Another ed., 1747, 1779, 8vo; *Lond.*, 1802, 12mo.
In vol 5 of collected works, *Lond.*, 1774, 12mo, 5 vols. The author was the well known poet and divine, Rector of Welwyn, Hertfordshire, 1730, d. 1765.

——— **Graveson** (Ign. Hyac. Amat. de) Epistolæ ad Amicum scriptæ. 3 vols. 4to. *Romæ.*
In quibus doctrina de Gratia in se ipsa efficaci et de Prædestinatione gratuita ad gloriam ante omnem prævisionem meritorem, contra scholæ Thomisticæ adversarios, adseritur ac vindicatur. See Walch i, 182; ii, 989—90.

——— The Controversy concerning Free Will and Predestination, set in a true light. pp. 26. 8vo. *Westminster.*

——— **Sanfelicius** (Jos.) Jansenii Doctrina ex Thomisticæ Theologiæ damnata. 4to. *Neapoli.*

No Date. **Tavelli** (Mt. Jos.) Essai sur la doctrine des pêres Grecs touchant la prédestination; trad. de l'Ital. 8vo. *Pavia.*

——— **Pfaffius** (Chr. Math.) Vindiciæ dictorum novi testamenti de libero arbitrio. *Tub.*

——— **Vitus** (Steph.) Vindicias.....synodi Dordracenæ. 8vo. *Casell.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Snitling** (Dan.) Animadversiones.
In answer to the Treatise of Hottinger, 1727.

——— ——— Epistola ad amicum de Stephani Viti vindiciis. 8vo.

1728. **D'Oyly** (Rob.) Four Theological Dissertations. 8vo. *Lond.*

One is on God's permitting the Fall of Man, and creating him capable of sin. 2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1729, 8vo, pp. lxvi, 486, cont. and Index. "This is a book which contains some original and curious disquisitions, but not always in accordance with received opinions. The discussions are conducted in a manner somewhat similar to those of Delany."—*Orme's Bibl. Bib.*, 156. It was recommended by Dr Adam Clarke. D'Oyly also pub. a serm. on "Providence vindicated by permitting wickedness and mischief," *Lond.*, 1811, 4to.

——— **Zopf** (Johann. Heinrich) Commentatio.....de providentia Dei fulminantis contra profanas Atheorum et naturalistarum cavillationes vindicata. 8vo. *Francofurti ad Menum.*

1729. **C[ollins]** (A[nthony]) A Dissertation on Liberty and Necessity. 8vo. *Lond.*

See 1715.

——— A Complete Body of Divinity. fol. *Lond.*

p. 146, The Decrees of God—p. 235, Providence —p. 533, The Covenant of Grace. Contains much of value. The editors have taken a sound view of what the Church of England teaches on Predestination. On the controversy between the Remonstrants and Calvinists they say:—"The former have chosen a better foundation for their opinion, and in the pursuit of it represented God in a more agreeable dress; the Calvinists have strong pretentions to scripture, but perhaps may be mistaken in the application of it. The Remonstrants have clearly the advantage, as to the opinion of the ancient church, but the Calvinists it must be acknowledged, have a much nearer conformity to the doctrines of our own."

——— **Glanaeus** (Aug.) Der besiegten particularisterey, in gründlicher wiederlegung der treviranischen vertheidigung zum ruhm der allgemeinen gnade Gottes in Christo. 4to.

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Manso** (Pet.) S. Augustinus Gratiæ Efficacis Efficacissimus propugnator contra Hæreticos priscos, et recentes: Dissertatio dogmatica de existentia, Quidditate, Necessitate et Utilitate Gratiæ adjuvantis, &c. *Matriti.*

——— **Wells** (Ed., *D.D.*) A Help for the right Understanding of the several Divine Laws and Covenants, chiefly designed for the benefit of young students in Divinity. 8vo. *Oxford.*

This is a valuable work.

The author was Rector of Bletchley, Bucks., and in 1717, Rector of Cottesbuch, Leicestershire; d. 1727.

——— **Burrows** (Robert, *LL.D.*) Essay on Providence. 8vo. *Lond.*

Besides a general Providence the author shows, that there are extraordinary occasions when God interposes in a particular manner. For account of this work see Jortin's Remarks on Eccl. History, ed. 1805, vol. 2, p. 26.

——— **Fancourt** (Saml.) An essay concerning Liberty, Grace, and Prescience. 8vo. *Lond.*

1729. The Doctrine of Predestination review'd, or God's counsels and decrees only a comparison to what men find in themselves. In a letter to a friend. pp. 31. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Gough** (Strickland) Sermons on effectual Calling. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Behmius** (Ern. Leop. Frid.) Interpretatio locorum quorundam quæ in beato Luthero aliisque theologis sæculi reformationis nonnullis difficultatem in articulo de prædestinatione habere videntur; cum Jo. Laur. Moshemii præfatione. 4to. *Helmst.*

This is a work of great merit.

——— **Lorenzonus** (Steph.) Dissertatio theologico analytica de vero intellectu trium celeberrimorum capitum X,XI, XII, divi Augustini de correptione et gratia seu de vera et falsa adjutoriorum distinctione. 4to. *Patav.*

1730. **Stievenard** (S.P.) Concertationes Jansenianorum contra Ecclesiam, et Scholæ Theologorum inter se circa gratiam et liberum arbitrium, &c. 4to. *Colon. Agrip.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

[1730.] **Hurrion** (John) The Scripture Doctrine of Particular Redemption stated and vindicated. 8vo.

The author was a congregational minister at Denton, Norfolk, and after in Hare Court, Lond. His works were collected 1823, 3 vols, 12mo.

1730. Dissertatio Scholastica de quinque Jansenii propositionibus, &c. 12mo. *Paris.*

——— **Bott** (Thos.) Remarks upon Butler's 6th chapter of the Analogy of Religion, &c., concerning Necessity.

Not in the Brit. Mus.

Dr. Kippis assigns this tract to 1738, but this is an error. Bott was Rector of Winbury, Norfolk, and d. 1754. His views were similar to Bishop Hoadley.

——— **Jackson** (John) A Vindication of Human Liberty. 8vo. *Lond.*

This is added to the 2nd ed. of "A Defence of human Liberty." See 1725.

——— **Lugo** (Cajet. Ben. de) Concursus Dei prævius et efficax Necessario cohærens cum libero Arbitrio humano a necessitate libero, &c. fol. *Romæ.*

Another ed., same place, 1737, 5 tom, 4to. This 2nd only in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Gretton** (Phillip, *D.D.*) Remarks on two pamphlets written by A. C., Esq., concerning Human Liberty and Necessity. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Palmer** (Robert, *D.D.*) Falling from Grace. 4to.

——— **Strutt** (Sam.) A Defence of Dr. Clarke's notion of natural liberty. 8vo. *Lond.*

1730. **Clarke** (Sam., *D.D.*) Sermons. 10 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*

Vol. 1, Omniscience of God—vol. 2, The Grace of God—vol. 3, The liberty of moral agents—vol. 7, Of God's disposing all things to their proper ends.

——— **Mayr** (Ant.) Tractatus de Peccatis et Gratia. pp. 697. 8vo. *Ingolst.*

Another ed., same place, 1632.

——— Assertiones theologicæ de Gratia Dei per Christum disputabuntur publice Romæ in Collegio Romano Societatis Jesu. fol. *Romæ.*

——— **Klemmius** (Jo. Chr.) Apologia doctrinæ de servo arbitrio. *Tub.*

——— **Wetstein** (John James) Prolegomena in N. Test. 4to. *Amst.*

Another ed., *Halæ*, 1764, 8vo. The author was a learned Lutheran divine, b. at *Basil*, 1693, d. 1754.

——— **Balguy** (John) Divine Rectitude; or a brief Enquiry concerning the moral perfections of the Deity: particularly in respect of Creation and Providence. 8vo.

This work was repub. in his collection of tracts, 1734, *Lond.*, 8vo, p. 105. It is designed to explain the divine dispensations on the subjects of creation, providence, redemption, and a future state. The author meant to show that each of these might be better explained on the principle of rectitude, than on that of benevolence. The first two heads only were treated in the above pamphlet, the 3rd was treated in his essay on Redemption 1741, 8vo; & 2nd ed., *Winchester*, 1785, 8vo; the 4th was never executed. Also author of "The Divine Government a certain and joyful truth," a serm., *Lond.*, 1739, 8vo; 1762, 8vo; 1773, 12mo. The author was Preb. of Salisbury, and Vicar of North Allerton in Yorkshire. He has been ranked as a theologian with Hoadley and Clarke. He died 1748.

1731. **Du Chesne.**—Histoire du Baianisme. 4to. *Duaci.*

——— **Coret** (Jacques) Le second Adam souffrant pour le premier Adam, &c. 6th ed. 12mo. *Liege.*

——— **Bossuet** (Jacq. Ben.) Traité du Libre arbitre et de la concupiscence. 8vo. *Paris.*

This treatise appeared in the 15th vol, p. 528, of the complete edition of his works in 59 vols, *Par.*, 1825, 12mo, and in "Ecrits Philosophiques," *Par.*, 1861, 12mo.

——— **Ritchie** (David, *D.D.*) Lectures on the Doctrinal Part of the Epistle to the Romans, Lects. xxvii—xxxviii.

——— Traité de la confiance Chrétienne, ou de l'usage légitime des vérités de la grace. 12mo. pp. 87.

——— **Marshall** (Nath., *D.D.*) Sermons. 4 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*

Vol 1, Proof of God and His providence.

Vol 3, God's foreknowledge of future contingencies, and his permission of them no excuse to the wicked instruments concerned in them. The author was Canon of Worcester, d. 1729.

1731.—[**Bayes** (Thos.)] Divine benevolence; or, an attempt to prove that the principal end of divine providence and government is the happiness of his creatures. 8vo. *Lond.*

An answer to Balguy on Divine rectitude.

——— **Greenup** (J.) A Vindication of human liberty. pp. 36. *Lond.*

——— Some reflections on Prescience. pp. x, 46. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Hunt** (Jeremiah, *D.D.*) An essay towards explaining the history and revelations of Scripture in their several periods. Part I.—To which is added a dissertation on the fall of man. 8vo. *Lond.*

The author was a dissenting minister for 37 years at Pinner's Hall, Lond.

——— The Glory of Divine Grace considered. A Serm. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Fabricius** (Jo. Alb.) Salutaris lux evangelii, toti orbi per divinam gratiam exoriens. 4to. *Hamb.*

——— **Bernard** (Jean Frédéric) Histoire de l'état de l'homme dans le Péché Originel, &c. 12mo.

This is a translation from the latin of A. Beverland, see 1678.

1732. **Millar** (Dav.) The Omniscience of God stated and vindicated. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— Traité de l'espérance chrétienne, contre l'esprit de pusillanimité et de défiance, et contre la crainte excessive. *Paris.*

——— **Watts** (Isaac, *D.D.*) Essay on the Freedom of Will in God and in creatures. 8vo.

On page 455, of vol 5 of his collected works, *Lond.*, 1812, 9 vols, 8vo, in which volume (p. 223), also will be found a tract upon the Ruin and Recovery of Mankind, which was published *Lond.*, 1742, 8vo. The essay of 1732 is not apparently in the Brit. Mus. In vol 2 he has a sermon on God's election of a people for himself.

——— **King** (Wm.) Two Sermons, the former concerning Divine Prescience, the latter on the Fall of Man. 8vo. *Lond.*

Another ed., in 1739, by Bp. E. Law, pub. in 8vo, at Cambridge.

——— **Mertin** (Chas.) Réfutation des critiques de Monsieur Bayle sur Saint Augustin. 4to. *Paris.*

——— **Thurston** (Joseph) The Fall, in four books. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Hallett** (Joseph) A Free and Impartial study of the Holy Scriptures recommended. 3 vols, 8vo. *Lond.*

Vol 2, Discourse of the meaning of the word of God, and of the doctrine of providence, and of the origin of evil. The author was an Arian divine but his Arianism comes out but rarely in this volume, which contains much research and deep learning. He d. 1744.

1732. **Seed** (Jeremiah) The Moyeı Lectures.

The corruption of our nature, &c., in discourses pub. *Lond.*, 1747, 8vo, vol 2, p. 331. In this same vol, p. 131, he has a sermon on the nature, possibility, and truth of a particular providence.

Various eds.

——— **Lewenberg** (Meichardus or Rudolphus) Doctrina Jansenii ex Thomisticæ theologiæ præceptis damnata, a quodam Soc. Jesu. recusa. 8vo. *Viennæ.*

The author was a Prof. of Philosophy at Gratz, in 1687, and died in 1715. See De Backer, v. 430.

——— **Lange** (Jo.) Evang. Lehre von der Allgem. Gnade, etc. 8vo. *Hallæ.*

——— **Weismannus** (Christ. Eberh.) Dissertatio de vita et controversiis Victorini Strigelii. 4to. *Tub.*

——— **Œderus** (Geo. Lud.) Modesta et solida responsio ad viri clarissimi Stephani Viti iniquissimum librum, quem inscripsit Apologiam. 8vo. *Hamb.*

——— [**Fasting** (C.)] Specimen tractatus de providentia divina. 8vo. *Coppenhag.*

——— **Strutt** (Sam.) Philosophical Enquiry into the Physical Spring of Human Actions. 8vo.

——— **Delany** (Patrick, *D.D.*) Revelation examined with candour. 2 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*

Vol 1 on some difficulties and objections which lie against the Mosaic account of the Fall. Vol 3, *Lond.*, 1763, 8vo.

The author was an Irish clergyman, d. 1768. His work is curious and replete with valuable information.

——— Gepredestineerden Dief.

1733. **Heerfordt** (Laurentius) Dissertatio de hæresi prædestinatiana, ab Augustino præter opinionem invecta. *Hafniæ.*

——— **Schmid** (Jacob.) Tractatus Vom. natürlicken lebensziel. 8vo. *Lips.*

——— **Lugo** (Cajet. Ben. de) Vera Christi Gratia juxta Mirabilem SS. Augustini et Thomæ doctrinam stabilita, atque Jansenii et Quesnelli. 4to. *Romæ.*

——— **Berriman** (Will, *D.D.*) Sermon: The regard had by Providence to prosperous iniquities. 8vo. *Lond.*

The author was Rector of St. Andrew-Undershaft, d. 1749—50.

——— Heaven open to all men. pp. xxviii. 115. 8vo. *Lond.*

Another edition, *Lond.*, 1766, pages vii, 78, 8vo.

——— **Campbell** (John) A new and complete history of the Holy Bible. 2 vols. fol. *Lond.*

Vol 1, P. 58. Condition of Adam after the Fall. The author says in his preface, "I have applied myself so closely to this history of the Pentateuch, as, in sixteen months not to have stirred more than one hundred yards from home, above ten times at most."

1733. **Martene** (Edmund) Veterum scriptorum et monumentorum historicorum, dogmaticorum, moralium, amplissima collectio. 9 vols. fol. *Paris.*

Vol 9, p. 1075. Harmonia, sive tractatus de libero arbitrio et gratia auctore Viviano Præmonstrantensi.

Also in Migne (J. P.) Patrologiæ cursus completus, &c., tom. 166, 1844, etc., 8vo.

——— **Canterbury** (B. D.) Human Liberty. *Canterbury.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Quadros** (Diégo de) Caducens Theologicus, et crisis Pacifica de Examine Thomistico. pp. 569. fol. *Matritii.*

Treats of Grace.

——— **Schardt** (Christian) Quæstio de Prædestinatione et reprobatione. 4to. *Olomucii.*

——— **Atkey** (Anthony) The Rectitude of Providence under the severest dispensations. 8vo.

——— **Foerschan** (Jo.) Quæstiones de Prædestinatione et Reprobatione. 4to. *Olomucii.*

——— **Fromm** (Jo.) Opus theologicum de prædestinatione et reprobatione. 4to. *Olomucii.*

The author was a Jesuit, Chancellor of the Univ. of Olmutz, and d. 1739.

——— The Free Agency of Accountable creatures, examined and defended in several letters. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Lorenzius** (Jo. Mich.) De Universali evangelii in mundo prædicatione. *Argent.*

——— **Driessen** (Anton.) Hypotheses Arminianizantes, *H. Venema,* detectæ et refutatæ. 4to. *Groningæ.*

——— [**Cooke** (Thos.)] Demonstration of the Will of God in the light of Nature. 8vo.

1734. **Hieronymus** (Saint Eusebius) Opera. 11 vols. fol. *Per.*

Vol 2, p. 1, Pelagius—ad Demetriadem virginem; p. 146, Pelagius: Symboli explanatio ad Damasum. The Epistle to Demetriades was reprinted, *Halæ*, 1775, 8vo, by J. S. Semler.

——— **Augustin** Défense de la Doctrine de St. Augustin touchant la grace efficace par elle-même. 12mo. *Utrecht.*

——— **Forster** (Joseph) Two Essays; the one on the origin of evil: the other on the foundation of the soul. pp. 63. 8vo. *Newcastle upon Tyne.*

——— **Effinger** (P.) Judicium Thomæ in causa controversa, sive Concordia Thomistica libertatis creatæ in linea Gratiæ et Naturæ cum intrinseca efficaciavoluntatis divinæ sine Prædeterminatione Physica et Scientia Media. 4to. pp. 850. *Constantiæ.*

1734. **Jackson** (John) The Existence and Unity of God. 8vo. *Lond.*
This work was attacked by Mr. Edm. Law, who was replied to in "A Defence," see 1735.

——— **Beausobre** (Isa. de) Histoire critique de Manichée et du Manichéisme. 2 vols. 4to. *Amst.*
Vol. 2. De l'homme, de sa liberté, de son peché, &c.
Of great learning. Southey says of this work, it "is one of the most valuable that I have ever seen: it is a complete Thesaurus of early opinions philosophical and theological." The author was a Protestant, who left France on account of his religion and settled in Prussia, where he died in 1738. Another ed., *Amster.*, 1734—39, 2 vols, 4to.

——— **Gerdes** (Daniel) Doctrinæ gratiæ, sive compendium theologiæ dogmaticæ. 4to. *Duisb.*
Another ed., same place, 1744, 4to. The author was Prof. of Theology and Ecclesiastical Hist. at Duisburg, and d. in 1767.

——— **Araujo** (Joseph de) Cursus Theologici. fol. 2 vols: vol 1, pp. 331 and 294; vol 2, pp. 413 and 366. *Ulyssip.*
Vol. I. Disp. V. P. 154, De Gratia actuali.
" " VI. P. 254, De Prædestinatione et Reprobatione.
Vol. 2. " XIII. P. 164, De Gratia habituali.
" " XV. P. 338, De Voluntate Dei.
The author was a Jesuit.

——— **Baumgartenus** (Siegmund. Jacob.) De imputatione peccati adamitici, posteris facta. *Hale.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Orsus** (Josep. Aug.) De Petri a Soto et Jadoci Ravesteyn concordia gratiæ et liberi arbitrii. 4to. *Romæ.*

——— [**De Baieux** (Tranquille)] Défense de la doctrine Saint Augustin touchant la grace efficace par elle même: par l'auteur de l'instructions théologique sur les promesses. 12mo. *Utrecht.*
Not apparently in B. M.

——— **Acindynus** (Gregorius) De essentia et operatione Dei.....editore J. Gretsero. fol.
Another ed., *Migne*, (J. P.) vol 151, 1857, 4to.

[1734.] **Brine** (John) The Covenant of Grace open'd. 8vo. *Lond.*
Also author of "Grace proved to be at the sovereign disposal of God," a Disc., *Lond.*, 1760, 8vo.

1734. [**Dutton** (Anne)] A Narration of the wonders of Grace, in verse. To which is added a poem on the special work of the spirit in the hearts of the Elect. 8vo. *Lond.*
Another ed., *Lond.*, 1833, 8vo.

——— Wisdom the first spring of action in the Deity. A Discourse in which... the absurdity of an unbounded liberty is shewn. 8vo. *Lond.*

1735. **Gill** (John, *D.D.*) The Cause of God and Truth. 2 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*
Other ed., *Lond.*, 1755, 4 vols, 8vo; 1772 and 1775, 4to; 1814, 2 vols; 1816, 2 vols, 8vo; 1838, 8vo, 1855, 8vo. It is a very full answer to Whitby on the Five Points. The author was a Baptist Minister holding the Supralapsarian hypothesis. The work is certainly one of the ablest, supporting the extreme calvinistic view. It is divided into four parts. In the first those passages of scripture are considered which the Arminians make use of in favour of their sentiments concerning Election and Reprobation, Original Sin, Redemption, Free Will, and the Perseverance of the Saints; and the Calvinistic sense of such passages is given and the attempt is made to vindicate them from the interpretation put upon them by some. In the second part, the passages of scripture which are made use of by the Calvinists in support of their views are explained, and the objections of the Arminians answered. The third part contains the arguments from reason against these doctrines, and the fourth part gives the sense of the early fathers before Augustine concerning those points. It is remarkable that in the author's "Body of Divinity," he is so far from condemning the sublapsarian hypothesis, or even the Arminian, that he attempts to shew how the two systems coalesce. He was a learned man, without delicacy of taste or soundness of judgment. He d. 1771.

——— **Gibson** (Edmund) The great work of Redemption by Christ. 8vo. *Lond.*
The author was Bp. of London in 1723, and d. 1748.

——— **Reinhardus** (Laur.) Breviarium Controv. cum Reformatis una cum Breviario Controv. cum Arminianis. 8vo. *Vinar, Weimar.*
"Historiam ac dogmata religionis reformatæ summatim exhibet."—*Walch.* ii, 396.

——— Conclusiones Theologicæ de divina gratia quas publice propugnandas exhibet Matthæus Panizzoni, ex Academia Veron. apud P. P. Soc. Jesu. 4to. pp. 11. *Veronæ.*
See De Backer, vi, 747.

——— **Lange** (Jo.) Fester Grund der Evang. Hauptlehre von der allgem. Gnade Gottes. 8vo. *Halæ.*

——— **Waldschmidius** (Jo. Jac.) Heilsame gnade gottes, aus der heiligen schrift vorgestellet, mit verwerfung der so genannten allgemeinen gnade, von herrn D. Joach. Langen in einer schrift vorgetragen. 8vo. *Marpurg.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Jackson** (John) A defence of a book intitled, The Existence and Unity of God, &c. [in answer to Edm. Law]. 8vo. *Lond.*

[1735.] **Tolpo** (J.) Dissertatio.....de Justificatione hominis peccatoris, *etc.*, *Resp.* Bange (Gustavus). 4to.

1736. Some doctrines on the Supralapsarian Scheme examined, etc. 8vo. *Lond.*

To this tract Dr. Gill replied in a tract entitled "Truth Defended," etc.

——— **Adams** (Ric.) Some Discourses wherein the being of a God, and of his watchful Providence over all his creatures, are asserted and maintained, &c. 8vo. *Lond.*

1736—39. **Venerius** (Fort.) Opera Omnia. 7 vols, fol. Vol. 2. Humanæ Infirmitatis Robur, i.e., de Divina Gratia. *Romæ.*

1736. **Ricardus** a S. Augustino, Laqueus contritus sue falsa calumnia vera confut. respons. qua doctrina August. Thomist. de Dei gratia et creata libertate a Calvinismi et Jansenismi horrend. impacto liberatur. pp. 345. 8vo. *Lugd.*

——— **Welsted** (Leonard) The Scheme and Conduct of Providence from the Creation. 8vo. *Lond.*

In the Brit. Mus. Catalogue assigned to the year [1740 ?]

——— **Carpovius** (Jac.) Comment. de Imputatione facti proprii et alieni, speciatim vero peccati Adami in posteros contra Dan. Whitbyum. 8vo. *Lips.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Mertin** (Chas.) Véritable Clef des ouvrages de S. Augustin contre les Pélagiens, prouvée par l'état même des questions et des Controverses qui sont traitées dans les livres du Saint Docteur. *Par.*

——— **Pusch** (Sigismond) Theologiæ Speculativæ, Tract. III. De Peccatis, Gratia et Merito. pp. 80, 168, 540. 12mo. *Impensis.*

The author was a Jesuit, who d. in 1735.

——— **Lange** (Jo.) Des beytrags zur lehre von der allegem gnade. *Jenæ.*

This has a preface by J. N. Rusius.

——— **Spizius** (Jo. Phil.) Evangelische lehre von der nicht allgemeinen gnade. 8vo. *Francof.*

——— **Heinsius** (Greg.) Schreiben au seinen Timotheum. 8vo. *Marp.*

On Grace.

——— **Doddridge** (Philip, *D.D.*) Ten Sermons on the Power and Grace of Christ: or, Evidences of his Glorious Gospel. 12mo. *Lond.*

2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1741, 8vo; 4th ed., *Lond.*, 1760, 12mo.

The author was the well known expositor.

He also published a Serm. on "Submission to Divine Providence in the death of children," 1736—7, etc., "Reflections on the conduct of Divine Providence in the series and conclusions of the late War," 1749.

D. 1751.

1736. **Butler** (Joseph, *D.C.L., Bishop of Durham*) The Analogy of Religion. 4to.

2nd ed., 1750, 8vo. Numerous other eds. of this celebrated work, which displays a depth of thought and profundity of mind possessed by few.

——— **Brine** (John) Remarks on a pamphlet intitled, Some Doctrines on the Supralapsarian Scheme impartially examined by the Word of God. 8vo. *Lond.*

1737. **Bridge's** Divine Wisdom. (Providence.)

Not apparently in the British Mus.

1737—45. **Becerra** (Benedictus Gil.) Asserta Theo—Subtilia, vel theologica sisthematica de essentia et efficacia et voluntatis Divinæ, et moralitate voluntatis humanæ, etc. 2 vols. fol. *Barcin*[*one*], *Lleren*[*a*].

1737. [**Bellelli** (F.)] Mens Sancti Augustini de modo reparationis humanæ post lapsum. 2 vols. *Romæ.*

Against Baianism and Jansenism.

Not in Brit. Mus.

——— Remarks upon Dr. Butler's Sixth Chapter of the Analogy of Religion concerning Necessity, and also upon the Dissertation of the Nature of Virtue. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— Several Letters to the Rev. Mr. Jackson from William Dudgeon, with Mr. Jackson's answers to them. Concerning.....God's moral Government of the world: the nature of necessity and fate, and of liberty and action, etc. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Burnet** (Thos.) The Scripture Doctrine of the Redemption of the World by Christ, explained to the capacity of mean people. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Bernhold** (Jo. Balthas) Dissertatio de Prædestinatianis, hæreticis seculi 5. 4to. *Altorf.*

Not in the B. M.

——— **Benson** (George) Letters concerning the end and design of Prayer and the Doctrine of Predestination. 8vo. *Lond.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

The author was an eminent Nonconformist Divine, in early life holding Calvin's doctrine of predestination, but veering later to a modified form of doctrine. He was Pastor of the congregation of Protestant Dissenters, Crutched Friars, London.

1737. [Berti (J. L.)] Opus de theologicis Disciplinis. *Rom.*

Another ed., *Bessani*, 1776, 7 tom, fol. This last, and not ed. of 1737, in B. M.

This system was attacked by the Jesuits as reviving the errors of the Jansenists, but the author in his reply defended himself by distinguishing between the teaching of Augustin and Jansenius. He was one of the most learned ornaments of the Augustinians. He was Prefect of the Anglican Library at Florence, and subsequently Professor of Theology at Pisa.

"Vir Angelici ingenii Theologus profundissimus Historicus eruditissimus et in lingua Hebraica et Græca versatissimus."—*Ossinger.*

——— **Amat de Graveson** (Ignatius Hyacinthus) Epistolæ Apologeticæ..... pro doctrina SS. Augustini et Thomæ, de Gratia se ipsa efficaci et gratuita electorum ad gloriam prædestinatione. 8vo. *Veronæ.*

[1737.] **Ward** (Zion) *pseud.* [i.e., John Ward] The Origin of Evil discovered. 8vo. *Birmingham.*

1738. **Bedford** (Arthur) The doctrine of Assurance. A Sermon. 8vo. *Lond.*

2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1739, 8vo. The author was Chaplain to the Prince of Wales B. 1668, and died 1745.

——— Discours sur les Preuves des vérités de la Foi. 12mo. *Nanci.*

——— **Danes** (Petrus Ludovicus) Tractatus de Peccato originali, Legibus et Gratia. 8vo. *Lovanii.*

Rare.

——— **Wigglesworth** (Ed., *D.D.*) An Inquiry into the truth of the imputation of the guilt of Adam's first sin to his posterity. Lectures. 4to. *Boston* [*U.S.*]

——— **Fleming** (Caleb) Remarks on Mr. Thos. Chubb's short dissertation on Providence. 8vo. *Lond.*

Fleming was also the author of an essay on the Scripture account of Man's redemption, *Lond.*, 1745, 8vo. He was a Socinian, and in 1752 succeeded Dr. James Foster, at Pinner's Hall.

——— **Driessen** (Ant.) Erläuterte und vertheidigte lehre der besondern gœttlichen gnade. *Franck.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— Historia doctrinæ de peccato originali. *Jenæ.*

Translated into German in Walch's Miscellanea, p. 173.

——— **Denham** (Jos.) The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ considered. A serm. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Lilienthalius** (Theo. Christ.) Disputatio de Pelagianismo ante Pelagium. *Jenæ.*

This will be found in Walch's Miscel. Sacris., p. 575.

——— **Taylor** (John, *D.D., of Norwich*) The Scripture Doctrine of Original Sin. 8vo.

This work by a Unitarian has a Socinian tendency, and was written against Jonathan Edwards and John Wesley. Lowndes states that he is considered one of the ablest writers in defence of the Arminian System, but this is not the case. He is rejected by Calvinists and Arminians alike. Numerous editions of the work have appeared, 1740; 1741; 3rd ed., *Belfast*; 1746, 12mo, *Lond.*; 4th ed., *Newcastle*, 1845, 12mo, pp. 231. Other ed., 1750, 1760, and 1767, 8vo. Transl. into Germ., *Erfurt.*, 1769, 8vo; with notes, 1845, 12mo. The author was Pastor of a Presbyterian congregation in 1733, and left this place to superintend an Academy at Warrington, Lanc., in 1757, and d. 1761.

1738. **Chubb** (Tho.) The true Gospel of Jesus Christ asserted; with a dissertation on Providence. pp. 233. 8vo. *Lond.*

He admits that on extraordinary occasions God may immediately interpose to bring about such events as are necessary to answer His purposes, which events would not have been brought about in the course of his *general* Providence; but that he should be *frequently* and almost *perpetually* immediately interposing in the affairs of the world the author considered unlikely and to be disputed. The above work was answered by [C. Fleming] *Lond.*, 1738, 8vo, and by Laurence Jackson, 1739, 3vo. The author published a vindication of the above work, *Lond.*, 1739, 8vo.

1739. **Crousay** (John Pet. de) Translated into English by the celebrated Miss Carter with some assistance from Dr. Johnson, under the title of "An Examination of Mr. Pope's Essay on Man, containing a succinct view of the system of the Fatalists, and a confutation of their opiuions, with an illustration of the doctrine of Freewill, and an inquiry what view Mr. Pope might have in touching upon the Liebnitzian philosophy and fatalism. *Lond.*

——— De la Nature de la Grace, où l'on fait voir ce que c'est que la Grace de J. C. considérée en général, et indépendamment du sujet, c'est à dire, de l'être particulier où elle consiste. 12mo. pp. 141.

——— **Heywood** (Henry) A Treatise concerning Original Sin by D. Whitby, *D.D.*, transl. with a large Introduction. 8vo. *Lond.*

1740 is the date assigned to copy in Brit. Mus. Cat.

——— **Batty** (Adam.) 26 Sermons on various subjects. 2 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*

Vol 1, p. 71. The bounty of Providence displayed in the fruitfulness of the earth.

Vol 2, p. 111. Perseverance in our Christian calling.

——— Berry Street Sermons. 2 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*

Vol 1. Of the Decrees of God and his transactions with men, (8 serms.) and one on "Effectual calling, with its fruits.' This is the 2nd ed.

——— **Jackson** (Laurence, *B.D.*) An examination of a book intituled "The True Gospel of Jesus Christ asserted by Thomas Chubb; and also of his appendix on Providence." 8vo. *Lond.*

1739. **Hingerle** (Augustin) Theses theologicæ de Peccatis, Gratia et Merito. fol. *Viennæ.*

——— **Wollebius** (Jo. Jac.) Harmonirendes systema zwischen dem absolut und conditionaten rathschluss der besondern und der allgemeinen gnade. 8vo. *Basil.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Schlosserus** (Jo. Lud.) Lutherus Lutheranus, &c. 8vo. *Hamb.*

As to this discussion, see Walch ii, 455, 456.

——— Abregé historique des detours et des variations du Jansenisme, depuis son origine jusqu'a present. 4to. *S.L.*

——— Les vrais sentiments de S. Augustin sur la grace, et son accord avec la liberté. 8vo. *Rouen.*

——— **Wesley** (John) Free Grace, a serm. preached at Bristol. pp. 35. *Bristol.*

2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1740; 3rd, 1741; 4th, 1754.
The 1st ed. not in the Brit. Mus.
Wesley was an Arminian, and for many years the editor of the "Arminian Magazine," after continued under the title of the Methodist Magazine.

1740. **Zinzendorf** (Nicholas Lewis) 16 Discourses on the Redemption of Man by the death of Christ. 12mo. *Lond.*

The author was Bp. of the Moravian Brethren; d. 1760, aged 60. Extracts from this work pub. by J. Wesley, 1744, 12mo.

——— De origine animæ et malo hæreditario. 8vo. *Holmiæ.*

——— **Wesley** (John) Serious considerations concerning the Doctrines of Election and Reprobation. Extracted from a late author. p. 12. 12mo. *Lond.*

The passages extracted will be found in Watts' "Ruin and Recovery of Mankind," 3rd ed., *Brist.*, 1769; 4th ed., *Lond.*, 1778. Another ed., 1809, 12mo.

——— **Langius** (Joachium). Gloria Christi, cum appendice de Gratia Dei universali in universali redemptione et merito Christi fundata. *Amst.*

——— **Vaillant de la Bassardries** (Will.) L'Accord de la Grâce et de la Liberté; poëme accompagné de remarques critiques et historiques. pp. 306. 4to. *Tournay.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.
"Les MSS. de cet ouvrage" says De Backer, "sont nombreux et offrent beaucoup de variantes; plusieurs n'ont pas de notes. L'auteur semble avoir opposé ce poëme à celui de Racine.'

——— [**Du Sellier** (Osmont)] Réponse à la Bibliothèque Janséniste avec des remarques sur la réfutation des critiques de M. Bayle, &c.

——— **Carter** (Nicholas, *D.D.*) The success of Arms depends on God's Providence. A Serm. 8vo. *Lond.*

1740. [**Chambre** (l'Abbé de la)] La Réalité du Jansénisme démontré. 12mo.

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Turnbull** (Geo.) Principles of Moral Philosophy; an Enquiry into the wise and good government of the Moral World. 2 vols. 8vo.

Treats of Providence.

——— **Heywood** (Henry) A Defence of Dr. Whitby's Treatise of Original sin. pp. 48. 8vo. *Lond.*

An attack on Dr. John Gill.

[1740.] **Schwarz** (Christ. Gottl.) De lapsu primi hominis, &c.

1740. **Kolbe** (Franc.) Disputatio speculativo-theologica in primam partem Doctoris Angelici Divi Thomæ. 8vo. *Pragæ.*

Vol 3. De peccatis, gratia, etc.

——— **Jennings** (David, *D.D.*) A Vindication of the Scripture Doctrine of Original sin, from Mr. Taylor's free and candid examination of it. 8vo. *Lond.*

The author was a Disseuter, and divinity tutor at Coward's Academy, 1744; Pastor of a congregation in Old Gravel Lane, Wapping, 1744—1762.

——— **Picardus** (Em.) Laqueus Contritus; seu falsa calumnia verâ confuta responsione, qua doctrina Augustina-Thomistica de Dei gratia liberatur. 8vo. *Lugd.*

——— **Vellus** (Jo. Bapt.) Depulsio Calumniarum. 8vo. *Lovan.*

——— **Heath** (Benj.) The Divine existence, unity and attributes.

The author was Recorder of Exeter, and died 1766.

——— **Colonia** (D. de) Réponse à la Bibliothèque Janseniste. 12mo. *Nanci.*

——— **Cooper** (Will.) The doctrine of Predestination unto life, explained and vindicated. In 4 Serm. 12mo. *Boston* [*U. S.*]

Other ed., *Lond.*, 1741, 12mo. *Boston* [*U. S.*] 1765, 12mo; 1804, *Edinb.*, 1807, 12mo, 1834. "A candid and practical view of this doctrine."—*Bickersteth.* The author was in 1737 elected Presid. of Harvard Coll., but declined the office. He d. 1744, aged 49.

——— **Whiston** (Thos.) The important doctrines of Original sin, etc., clearly stated from Scripture. 8vo. *Lond.*

1741. **Wesley** (John) Hymns on God's Everlasting Love; to which is added, The Cry of the Reprobate, and the horrible Decree. pp. 36. 12mo. *Bristol.*

Another ed., 1756, 12mo, which is in the Brit. Mus., but not the ed. of 1741.

——— ——— Serious Considerations on absolute Predestination; extracted from a late author [R. Barclay]. pp. 24. *Bristol.*

Other ed., *Brist.*, 1770; *Lond.*, 1790, 12mo. This last the only ed. in the Brit. Mus.

1741. **Wesley** (John) The Scripture doctrine concerning Predestination, Election, and Reprobation.
pp. 16. 12mo. *Lond.*

——— ——— Dialogue between a Predestinarian and his friend.
pp. 7. 12mo. *Lond.*

2nd ed., 1741, 12mo; 3rd ed., *Brist.*, 1742, 12mo; *Lond.*, 1799, 12mo. These 2 last ed. only in the Brit. Mus. In Wesley's Collected Works, 3rd ed., *Lond.*, 1829, 14 vols, 8vo, will be found the following Sermons, vol. 2, p. 54, Original Sin; p. 215, The Fall of Man; p. 225, Predestination; p. 313, Divine Providence; vol. 7, p. 373, Free Grace; vol. 10, p. 204, Predestination calmly considered, and the above tract, and Dialogues between an Antinomian and his friend—Serious thoughts upon the perseverance of the Saints—Answer to "Letters to the Author of Theron and Aspasio"—The question 'What is an Arminian?' answered—Thoughts on God's sovereignty and other tracts.

——— **Balguy** (John) An Essay on Redemption. 8vo. *Lond.*

Another ed., *Winchester*, 1785, 8vo. Archbp. Magee observes that Balguy has argued this point with uncommon strength and clearness. In his Essay he explains the doctrine of Atonement in a manner somewhat similar to that adopted by Dr. John Taylor of Norwich. He fails in the positive part as has been pointed out by Bishop Hoadly. See 1634.

——— **Robinson** (Nich., *M.D.*) The Christian philosopher, or a Divine Essay on the Principles of Man's Universal Redemption. 8vo. *Lond.*

Book i, ii, and appendix, 1742. Another ed., 1757, 2 vols, 8vo.

——— **Cooke** (Saml.) Divine Sovereignty in the salvation of sinners considered. A Serm. 12mo. *Boston* [*U.S.*]

——— **Chubb** (Tho.) An inquiry concerning Redemption, wherein the Christian Redemption is particularly considered. 8vo.

The ed. in the Brit. Mus. is *Lond.*, 1743, 12mo.

——— **Tutty** (Will.) Divine Love exemplified in the Redemption of Mankind, on John ix, 10. 8vo.

——— **Moret** (Greg.) Tract. de gratia Christi—De sacramentis et peccatis, &c.
pp. 356. 4to. *Friburgi Helvet.*

——— An Essay on the Divine Prescience and Man's Free Agency, delivered at a Conference in which a celebrated Doctor in Divinity was President, April 2, 1741.
8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Morgan** (Thos., *M.D.*) Physico-theology: or a philosophico-moral disquisition concerning human nature, free agency, moral government, and divine providence. 8vo. *Lond*

——— **Turretinus** (Joh. Alph.) In Pauli ad Romanos Epistolæ cap. xi prælectiones criticæ, theologicæ et concionatoriæ. 4to. *Laus.*

1741. **Acton** (Samuel) 20 propositions advanced by Mr. Calvin and his followers; with a short remark on each of them. The doctrine of eternal reprobation refuted, &c. 8vo.

——— **Burt** (Job) The doctrine of eternal reprobation refuted. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Wigglesworth** (Edw., *D.D.*) The Sovereignty of God in the exercise of His Mercy; and how he is said to harden the hearts of men. Lectures.
12mo. *Boston* [*U.S.*]

1742. **Ridley** (Gloucester, *LL.D.*) Eight Serm. on the Divinity and Operations of the Holy Ghost. 8vo. *Lond.*

p. 209, Grace attainable by all. The author was a clergyman of the Ch. of England, b. 1702, d. 1774. He was an accomplished Syriac scholar.

——— **Maffei** (Scipio) Istoria Teologica, delle Dottrine e delle opinioni corse ne' cinque Primi Secoli della chiesa in proposito della Divina Grazia, del Libero Arbitrio e della Prædestinazione.
fol. *Trident.*

See Walch ii, 991.

——— **Jost** (G.) Tractatus theol. de gratia Christi Salvatoris, de Sacramentis et peccatis. 4to. *Frib. Helvet.*

——— **Cradock** (Zach., *D.D.*) Serm. before K. Chas. II., 1678, on the Providence of God in the government of the world. pp. 54. 12mo. *Lond.*

The author was Provost of Eton in 1680.

——— **Grove** (Henry) Sermons.
4 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*

Vol. 2, p. 234, Diversities of Conditions among mankind, the appointment of Providence. The author was a dissenting minister at Fulwood, near Taunton, whose works have been very popular. He d. 1737. In the 3rd vol, of the 3rd ed. of Sermons 1745, p. 177, will be found a sermon on The Providence of God vindicated in permitting the sufferings of Christ, and in the 4th vol., p. 91, a tract on "Human liberty."

——— **Warne** (Jonathan) The downfall of Arminianism. 8vo. *Lond.*

Rare, the only ed. met with is in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Wolfarth** (Fried. Paul) Controversia de mundo optimo, origine et permissione mali inter B. Prof. Koehlerum ac Dubitantium antibonum privatim habita nunc .....instar dialogi in lucem perducta a F. P. Wolfartho.
2 pt. 4to. *Jenæ.*

——— **Synge** (Edward, *D.D.*) Sober thoughts on Predestination.
12mo. *Lond.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

In vol. 4, of Collected Works, *Lond.*, 1740, 12mo, 4 vols. The author was Bp. of Clonfert, of Cloyne, of Ferns and Leighlin, and of Elphin, and finally Archbishop of Tuam, 1716, and d. 1741. He wrote also "The glory of man's redemption" [a christmas carol], [*Lond.*, 1810], broadside fol.

——— **Hochstetter** (J. H.) Remissio anticipata peccatorum futurorum, malum systematis prædestinationi consectarium. 4to. *Tub.*

1742. **Brekell** (John) A Critical and practical Discourse on making our Calling and Election sure. 8vo. *Lond.*
Not in Brit. Mus.
The author was a Unitarian minister at Liverpool, d. 1775.

——— **Buttstettius** (J. And.) Vernunftige gedanchen von der sorschung gottes, in auschung der erhaltung und mitwurckung. 8vo. *Guelph.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Baumgartenus** (Sieg. Jac.) De Vocatione dei ad salutem, variis ejus gradibus et graduum rationibus. *Halæ.*
Not in Brit. Mus.

——— **Timain** (Giles) The Real Christian; a treatise on effectual calling. 12mo. *Lond.*
"Containing some of the most discriminating views of Christian character I have ever met."—*Rev. J. O. Choules.*

1743. **Brine** (John) A Refutation of Arminian Principles. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— ——— Certain Efficacy of death of Christ asserted, &c. 8vo.
This is an answer to Watts (Isaac) on the "Ruin and Recovery of Mankind." Also author of "Animadversions on Letters (of R. Sanderman) on Theron and Aspasio, *Lond.*, 1758, 8vo; *Lond.*, 1827, 8vo, and "An Antidote against a spreading of Antimonian principles," *Lond.*, 1750, 8vo.

——— **Weickhmann** (Jo. S.) Antiqua doctor. Christianor. sententia de sempiterna gentium profanar. felicitate. 4to. *Witteb.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— Heaven open to all; a treatise in which is proved that all men shall be saved. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Worthington** (Will., *D.D.*) An Essay on the Redemption of Man. 8vo. *Lond.*
2nd ed., 1748, pp. 381, 8vo. The author was vicar of Blodwell in Shropshire, in 1740. The above work, and one on "The Historical sense of the Mosaic account of the Fall proved and vindicated" (*Lond.*, 1751, 8vo), drew the attention of Bishop Hare who presented him accordingly to the vicarage of Llangblodwell in Shropshire. The same Bishop later gave him a stall at St. Asaph, and Archbp. Drummond subsequently presented him with one in the cathedral of York. He died 1778.

——— **Hulsemannus** (Jo.) Brevis et orthodoxa discussio de Fide Infantum actuali. 4to. *Vitemb.*
(Predestination.) (Grace).

——— **Atterbury** (Lewis, *D.C.L.*) Sermons of, by Edward Yardley. 2 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*
Vol. 1, p. 158, of Providence. The author was Rector of Hornsey, Middlesex. He was refused the Archdeaconry of Rochester by his younger brother the Bishop.

1743. **Scott** (Joseph Nicol., *M.D.*) Sermons preached in defence of all religions whether natural or revealed, at the French Ch. at Norwich. 2 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*
Vol. 2, p. 265; The Scripture doctrine of Election and Reprobation examined. The author was a Universalist.

1744. **Mayhew** (Experience) Grace Defended. 4to.
The author was Minister at Martha's Vineyard. See Allibone ii, 1254.

[1744.] **Kahler** (Wig.) De Innocentia Dei circa lapsum primorum parentium.

1744. **Struggl** (Marc.) Theologia Universa in via recentiorum. 2 vols. fol. *Viennæ.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.
Contains;—De Gratia, Justificatione et Merito. "In qua tuetur quidem prædestinationem ante prævisa merita sed præmotionem physicam tamquam minus conformem, doctrina Conc. Trident. S. Augustini et ipsius S. Thomæ impugnat."—*Hurter.*

——— **Behrend** (J. Fr.) Harmonia Systematis de hodierna Animarum creatione et peccati Originalis propagatione. 8vo. *Berol.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

1744—52. **Gerdes** (Daniel) Introductio in historiam Evangelii seculo xvi, etc. 4 vols. 4to. *Groningæ.*
(History of Calvinism.)

1744. **Farmer** (John) Sermons on various divine subjects. 8vo. *Lond.*
p. 1, Salvation by grace; p. 278, Persevering Grace. The author was dissenting minister at Fetter Lane, Lond., 1730, and at Coggeshall, Essex, 1739. He was a Calvinist.

——— **Foster** (James, *D.D.*) Sermons. 4 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*
Vol. 3, 319. The doctrine of a particular providence (2 Serm.)—Vol. 2, contains a serm. on moral and natural evil. The 4th and best ed., 1755. The author was minister at Barbican, London, 1724; and at Pinner's Hall, 1744. He was the most popular preacher of his day.

——— **Walch** (John Geo.) Miscellanea Sacra. pp. 892. 4to. *Amst.*
p. 173, De historia doctrinæ de peccato originis—p. 229, De Providentia Divina—p. 575, De Pelagianismo ante Pelagium.
Of considerable value.

——— **Alticozzi** (Laur.) Summa Augustiniana ex collectis, ordinatis, disputatis, explicatisque sententiis Theologicis D. Aur. Augustine. 6 vols. 4to. *Romæ.*
Part 1, De Gratia Dei, et libertate hominis; Part iv (1755), Placita Pelagiana de Peccato Originali, et libero Arbitrio—part v and vi (1757), Placita Pelagiana et Divina Gratia. The author was a Jesuit, and d. 1777. De Backer says of him: "Il joignait à de vastes connaissances, beaucoup de piété, des mœurs douces, et une conversation vive et agreable," v. 6.
The above work is not in the Brit. Mus. The author wrote also "Dissertatio historico-critica de antiquis novisque Manichæis," *Romæ*, 1763, 4to.

1745. **Drieberge** (Joannes) De Prædestinatione et gratia liber.
pp. 254. 4to. *Amstelædami.*
The author was an Arminian divine. The catalogue of the Brit. Mus. dates this 1744, but this is not the date in the copy in author's possession.

——— **Hulsemannus** (Jo.) Fides salvifica Infantium, &c. 8vo. *Berol.*

——— **Busch** De Statu salutis reproborum Infantium. 4to.
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Ball** (Nathaniel) Sermons.
8vo. *Lond.*
p. 80, Prov., xv, 3, The divine Omniscience. 2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1756, 8vo.

——— Calvino-Lutheranismus: or an essay on the mysteries of predestination [on Deut. xxix, 29], freewill, &c.
i—xxx. pp. 96. 8vo. *Lond.*
A rare and curious work.

——— **Snape** (Andrew, *D.D.*) 45 Sermons. 3 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*
Vol 1, p. 347, Two Sermons on the necessity of working out our own salvation. The author was Canon of Windsor, 1713; Provost of King's Coll., 1719; served the office of Vice Chancellor, 1703; Rector of West Ildesley, Berkshire, 1737, d. 1742.

——— **Webster** (William, *D.D.*) Tracts consisting of sermons, discourses, and letters. pp. xvi. 388. 8vo. *Lond.*
p. 68, An Essay on Liberty.
p. 147, On Providonce.
p. 217, On Predestination.
The author was Curate of St. Dunstan's in the West, 1715; Rector of Deptden, Suffolk, 1733; Vicar of Ware and of Thundridge, Hertfordshire, 1741, d. 1758.

——— **Buttstettius** (Andr.) Vernunftige gedancken von der vorsehung gottes in ausehung der regierung der welt.
8vo. *Guelph.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Kernius** (Philipp. Earnest.) Gedancken von dem schicksal der ersten menschen. 8vo. *Jenæ.*

——— **Baumgartenus** (Sigism. Jac.) De propagatione et gradibus peccati originalis. *Halæ.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Wesley** (John) A Dialogue between an Antinomian and his Friend.
12mo. pp. 12. *Lond.*
A second dialogue published same year and place, which last, and a 3rd ed. of the two dialogues, *Lond.*, 1798, 12mo, are the only ones in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Finch** (Richard) Thoughts on the Sovereignty of God, the Doctrines of Election, Reprobation, and Original Sin. 8vo. *Lond.*
Another ed., 1793, 8vo.

——— **Cudworth** (William) Christ alone exalted. 12mo. *Lond.*

1745. **Bate** (Julius) Remarks on Mr. Warburton's remarks, &c., tending to show that the ancients knew there was a future state: and that the Jews were not under an equal Providence, etc.
8vo. *Lond.*

1746. **Dickinson** (Jo.) Vindication of God's sovereign grace.....with some brief reflections upon.....a pamphlet entitled a letter from Aristocles (*i.e.* Samuel Johnson, *D.D.*) to Authades.
8vo. *Boston* [*U.S.*]
Dickinson was Pres. of New Jersey College. Johnson was also the author of another letter on the sovereignty and the prescience of God, *Boston* [*U.S.*], 1745, 8vo. Beach (I.) wrote a reply to the above, 1747, 8vo, which called forth from Dickinson "A second Vindication," *Boston* [*U.S.*] 1748, 8vo; to which Beach replied 1748, 12mo. Dickinson was also author of "A display of God's special Grace," 1742, 4to.

——— **Gill** (Dr. John) A Defence of the Calvinistic against Arminian sentiments on the subject of Election, Original Sin, &c. *Lond.*

——— Ἀπόδειξις Historica, quod Calvinus in sua de prædestinatione doctrina sibi semper constat. 8vo.

——— **Knowles** (T., *D.D.*) The Existence and Attributes of God not demonstrable à priori. 8vo.

——— **Foxcroft** (T.) Divine Providence adored and justified. 8vo.
Rare.

——— **Denne** (John) God's Regard to Man in his works of creation and Providence. A serm. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Gude** (Gottleb. Friedr.) Dissertationum exegetico-theologicarum Trias.
4to. *Lips.*
The second dissertation "Paucitatem salvandorum a C. S. Curionis objectionibus vindicat."

——— **Cordier**—Nouveau système sur la Prédestination. 12mo. *Amst.*

——— **Berrow** (Capel.) The Providence of God over Christian Kingdoms considered. A Serm. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Blanco** (Mathias) Funiculus triplex, Divi Thomæ Præmotione, Scotico comitante Decreto et Scientia Media contextus; sive Tractatus de libertate creata sub Divina Scientia, Voluntate et Omnipotentia. 4to. *Mexici.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.
The author was a Jesuit, and died in Mexico in 1734.

——— Philosophische untersuchung von dem zustand des menschen in der erbsünde.

——— **Forstmannus** Der Lutherischen lehre von der allgemeinen gnade gottes grund, gewisheit und Schænheit.
8vo. *Lips.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

1746. **Schleefflus** (Jo.) Vortrag von der allgemeinen gnade gottes. 8vo. *Rostoch.*

——— **Harenberg** (J. Cp.) Theologia primor. Christianorum. 4to. *Braunschw.*

(*Grace.*)

——— **Amory** (Tho., *D.D.*) A Dialogue on Devotion.....to which is prefixed a Conversation of Socrates on the Providence of God, translated from the Greek [of Zenoph. de Memorab. Lib. 1, c 4]. 8vo. *Lond.*

2nd ed.

See 1766. The dialogue was first pub. [1745], 8vo.

——— **Brine** (John) A Vindication of some truths of natural and revealed religion. 8vo. *Lond.*

To this is added a dialogue between a Calvinist, a Socinian, an Arminian, a Baxterian, and a Deist, etc.

1747. **Kennicott** (Benjamin, *D.D.*) Two dissertations, I—On the tree of life, with some observations on the creation and fall of man. 2nd ed. 8vo. *Oxf.*

The author was Fell. of Exeter Coll., and Vicar of Culham, Oxford, Canon of Christ Church, 1770. D. 1783. A curious work.

——— **Knight** (Henry, *A.M.*) The Being and Attributes of God demonstrated in a method entirely new. 8vo. *Lond.*

A Dissenting minister at Chertsey, Surrey. "Of this very ingenious and learned work it is enough to say that it is recommended by Drs. Benson, Lardner, and Taylor."—*Bishop Watson.*

——— **Weismann** (Ch. E.) Jansenismus bifrons in doctr. de eccl. 4to.

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Weinacht** (Matthew) Gratia Divina omnibus necessaria, unicuique sufficiens, non omni efficax: Theologico Controversistice deducta contra Pelagianos, Semi-Pelagianos, Lutheranos, Calvinistas, Bajanos, et Jansenistas. 4to. pp. 258. *Pragæ.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

The author was a Jesuit, teacher of philosophy, and Provincial of Bohemia. He d. in 1764. He was also the author of a treatise entitled, 'Scientia Dei,' *Pragæ*, 1750, 4to.

——— **Perronet** (Vin.) Some Reflections by way of Dialogue on the Nature of Original Sin, &c. 12mo. pp. 102. *Lond.*

5th ed., 1767, pp. 123; 6th ed., *Lond.*, 1776, 12mo, pp. 123.

——— **Starckius** (Guilielm. Ernest) Betrachtungen vom baum der erkæntnis gutas und bæses. 8vo. *Franc.*

A refutation of the French work L'Etat de l'homme dans le peché originel.

——— **Gosselius** (Andr. Arnold) Die richtige mittelstrasse in der gnadenlehre der evangelisch-lutherischen kirche. 8vo. *Halæ.*

1747. **Finch** (Richard) A Free Examination of Mr. Cudworth's Free Thoughts on the Doctrine of Election, Fall of Man, and Restoration by Christ. 8vo. *Lond.*

Another ed., *Lond.*, 1755, 8vo.

——— **Cudworth** (William) Free Thoughts on the Doctrine of Election, Fall of Man, &c. 8vo. *Lond.*

A 2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1747, 8vo; examined by Finch (R.) 1747, 8vo, above.

——— **Berti** (J. L.) Augustinianum Systema de Gratia ab iniqua Baiani et Janseniani erroris insimulatione vindicatum. 2 vols. 4to. *Romæ.*

See 1750.

——— **Mullerus** (M. Gottl.) Schediasma Philosophico-Theologicum quo efficaciam precum haud esse prædeterminatam, &c. pp. 72. 12mo. *Vitembergæ.*

1748. A Discourse on Providence. 3rd ed. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— Instructions sur les vérités de la Grace et de la Prédestination, en faveur des simples Fidéles. 12mo. pp. 444. *Avignon.*

——— **Felton** (Henry, *D.D.*) 19 Sermons on the Creation, Fall, and Redemption of Man. 8vo. *Lond.*

Rector of Whitwell, Derbyshire, 1711; Principal of Edmund Hall, 1722.

——— **Hunt** (Jeremiah, *D.D.*) Sermons. 4 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*

Vol 2, p. 177, God the governor of moral agents.
,, p. 195, A general and particular providence.
Vol 4, Tract 4, Aphorisms on the being and attributes of God; freedom and agency.

——— **Eber** (Antoine) Theologiæ Speculativæ. Tractatus III—De Peccatis, legibus, gratia et merito. 8vo. pp. 720. *Vien.*

The author was a Jesuit, Prof. of philosophy and theology at Gratz and Vienna, and d. in 1746.

——— **Benson** (Geo.) The Doctrine of Predestination reviewed. 8vo. *Lond.*

In a collection of tracts.

——— **Shepherd** (James) Sermons on the following subjects, viz.:—vii and viii—The constitution of the covenant of Grace. 12mo. *Lond.*

The author was a Dissenter.

——— **Alexander** (Natal.) Historia Ecclesiastica ad Annum post Christum, 1600, &c. 9 vols. fol.

The 1st ed. was *Paris*, 1699, 8 vols, fol: 1714, 8 vols, fol. Other ed., *Lucæ*, 1734, 9 vols, fol; *Paris*, 1740—44, 18 vols, 4to; *Venet.*, 1771, 18 vols, 4to; *Venet.*, 1778, 9 vols, fol; *Bingii*, 1785—91, 20 vols, 4to. Vol v. of this ed. contains: "Dissert. de prædestinatiana hæresi," and vol. vi., p. 276; "Dissert. de causa Gotteschalci ejusque erroribus, damnatione," etc. "And what, say the Jesuits, is the great Church History of the Dominican Natalis Alexander, but an arsenal from which to this day the opponents of infallibility get their weapons."—*Quirinus an the Vatic. Counc.*

[1748.] [**Mochtarius**] Opuscula de Fide et de Reparatione lapsi. 4to. *Romæ.*

Colgan identifies Mochtarius as an Irish Priest.

1748. **Beach** (John) A second vindication of God's sovereign free grace. 12mo *Boston* [*Mass.*]

1749. Le Combat de l'erreur contre la vérité. pp. 168. 8vo. *Utrecht.*

——— [**Haynes** (Hopton)] The Scripture Account of the Attributes and Worship of God and of the Character and offices of Jesus Christ, by a Candid Inquirer after Truth. 8vo. *Lond.*

This work, written by a strenuous advocate for Socinianism, was reprinted by the Rev. Theop. Lindsay in 1790, 8vo. Hopton Haynes was 'a learned and able advocate for Unitarian doctrines.' His work is elaborate and much esteemed by persons of that persuasion.—*Lowndes.*

1749—52. **Foster** (James) Discourses on all the principal branches of natural religion and social virtues. 2 vols. 4to. *Lond.*

vol 1, p. 61, Omniscience of God; p. 165, Power and Providence of God; p. 273, Moral Liberty.

1749. **Heylyn** (John, *D.D.*) Theological Lectures at Westminster Abbey, with an interpretation of the New Testament. 2 vols. 4to. *Lond.*

Vol 1, p. 11, Original Sin. The author was sometimes called "the Mystic Doctor." He was Preb. of Westminster, and Rector of St. Mary-le-Strand.

——— **Prince** (Thomas) The Natural and Moral Government and Agency of God in causing Droughts and Rains. A serm. 8vo. *Boston.*

Reprinted *Lond.*, 1750, 8vo.

——— **Birch** (T.) Serm. on the Constitution of Man. 4to. *Lond.*

p. 1006, On Providence.

——— Enquiry concerning human liberty. 8vo. *Glasgow.*

1750. **Warburton** (Will., *D.D.*) The Doctrine of Grace. 8vo. *Lond.*

Several ed., 2nd, *Lond.*, 1763, 8vo; 3rd, *Lond.*, 1763, pp. 246, 12mo. The author was Bishop of Gloucester, and d. 1779. The work is a poor performance, and was written against by Andrews (J.) 1763, 8vo; Hartley (T.) Paradise restored, 1764, 8vo, and Whitefield (G.) 1763, 12mo. He was defended by Chandler (S.) and others. Warburton is best known for his "Divine Legation of Moses," (*Lond.*, 1738—41, 3 vols, 8vo), a work which has perhaps attracted more attention among the learned than any other in English theology.—See Allibone iii, 2570, Quart. Rev., vol ii, p. 401.

——— **Berti** (J. L.) Theologia historico-dogmatico-scholastica; access. Augustinianum systema de gratia ab iniqua Baiani et Janseniani erroris insimulatione vindicatum. 10 vols. fol. *Monachii.*

Vols ix, x, Augustinianum systema de gratia. Berti was one of the most learned of the Augustine Order. His system of theology was attacked by the Jesuits as reviving the errors of Jansen; but in his reply, which forms the last two volumes of the above work, the author attempts to establish the difference between the doctrine of Augustine and Jansen. The above work is of exceptional value.

[1750.] **Holloway** (Benj.) The True doctrine of Repentance vindicated..... to which is added an account of the state of man, his natural and spiritual powers, with the Decrees of his free agency from the creation downward till now. *Lond.*

The work is Hutchinsonianism in perfection. The author was a clergyman of the Church of England.

1750. **Carpovius** (Jac.) Illustratio apologetica Peccati in spiritum Sanctum atque Incredulitatis Finalis, tredecim Speciminibus comprehensa. 4to. *Jenæ.*

"Complectitur illa defensionem eorum, quæ antea vere tradiderat de peccato in spiritum sanctum adv. Engelstræmum et Hartmannum."—*Walch.*

——— **Taylor** (John, *D.D.*) The Scripture Doctrine of Atonement examined. 8vo. *Lond.*

Other ed., 1751, 1753, 8vo. The author is generally known as John Taylor of Norwich.

——— Dissertations by "Philalethes." 8vo. *Lond.*

One on the "Mosaick Account of the Creation and Fall," another on "Original Sin."

——— Décret de la Congrégation de l'Index contre la Bibliothèque Janséniste. pp. 126. 12mo. *Avignon.*

——— **Middleton** (Conyers, *D.D.*) Enquiry into the Mosaic account of the Fall. 8vo. *Lond.*

This is affixed to an examination of the Bp. of London's Discourse on Prophecy. The author was in 1723 Principal Librarian of the Public Library at Cambridge, and in 1731 Woodwardian Prof. He d. 1750, aged 67.

——— **Bundy** (Rich., *D.D.*) Select Sermons. 8vo. *Lond.*

p. 371, Reflections upon the Divine Providence. The author was Preb. of Westminster, a pleasing and instructive preacher, and an easy and fluent writer. He d. about 1739.

——— [**London** (John)] The Scheme of Divine Providence upon which the Christian religion is founded. pp. xi, 20, 38. 8vo. *Lond.*

[17—.] **Davis** (B.) Human Liberty philosophically considered. pp. 32. 8vo. *Canterbury.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

1750. **Rothfischerus** (Geo.) De gratia actuali et habituali. 4to.

——— **Oakes** (Abr.) A short essay on the Creation, Fall, and Redemption of Man. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Parker** (Will., *D.D.*) Mosaic History of the Fall considered. 8vo. *Oxon.*

1750. **Bate** (Julius) The use and intent of prophecy, and History of the Fall cleared. 8vo. *Lond.*

The author was a divine of the Hutchinsonian School, d. 1771. He was the author of "Remarks on Dr. Warburton's Remarks shewing that the ancients knew there was a future state: and that the Jews were not under an equal Providence," 1745, 8vo. He was a diligent scholar, but not judicious.

——— **Hampton** (James) A Plaine and Easy account of the Fall of Man. pp. 26. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Dickinson** (Moses) An inquiry into the consequences both of Calvinistic and Arminian principles compared together. 8vo. *Boston* [*U.S.*]

——— **Brine** (John) A Christian's Duty and Divine Efficiency represented. A Serm. 8vo. *Lond.*

[17—] **Nevay** (J.) Covenant of Grace. LII Sermons. *Glasgow.*

1751. **Parker** (Will., *D.D.*) The Scripture Doctrine of Predestination. Two Serm. on Rom. viii, 30.

Another ed., 1759, a copy of which is in the New York State Library.

——— **Lemoine** (Abraham) A Vindication of the Literal Account of the Fall. 4to.

The Author was Rector of Everley.

——— **Allen** (Joshua) 26 Sermons. 8vo. *Lond.*

p. 357, Matth. v: 45, The unequal dispensations of Providence accounted for and vindicated. (4 Sermons.)

——— **Berriman** (Will.) Christian doctrines and duties explained and recommended, in forty sermons. 2 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*

Vol. 1, p. 169, The Christian calling and election: how to be understood.

p. 189, How to make our calling and election sure.

Vol. 2, Christian liberty.

——— La vie de Pélage, contenant l'histoire des ouvrages de Saint Jerôme et de Saint Augustin, contre les Pélagiens. 12mo. *S.L.*

——— **Pluche** (Noel Anthony) The truth of the Gospel demonstrated from the dispensations of Providence preparative to it. 2 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Shepp** (John) Divine Energy: or the Efficacious operations of the Spirit of God upon the soul of Man, in his effectual calling and conversion stated, proved and vindicated. 2nd ed. 12mo. *Lond.*

Shepp was a Baptist minister, who d. 1721.

——— **Wesley** (John) Serious thoughts upon the Perseverance of the Saints. 12mo. pp. 24. *Lond.*

Another ed., *Dubl.*, 1752, 12mo. To this pamphlet Dr. John Gill the Baptist wrote an answer. The ed. of 1751 is not, but the ed. of 1752 is in the Brit. Mus.

1752. **Wesley** (John) Predestination calmly considered. pp. 83. 12mo. *Lond.*

Other ed., *Lond.*, 1755; *Brist.*, 1769: *Lond.*, 1776. 7th ed., *Lond.*, 1804, 12mo; 9th ed., *Lond.*, 1814, 12mo. Wesley vindicates the Arminian tenets on the subject.

——— **Gill** (John, *D.D.*) Predestination stated.

This is an answer to Wesley. Another ed., 1766.

——— **Fawcett** (J.) Critical Exposition of the 9th Romans, as far as it is snpposed to relate to Predestination. 8vo. *Lond.*

The author was a dissenting minister.

——— **Bate** (James) An essay towards a rationale of the literal doctrine of Original Sin. pp. viii, 111. 8vo. *Lond.*

Occasioned by some of Dr. Middleton's writings. Another ed., *Lond.*, 1766, 8vo. In this 2nd ed., the author laments that it was his hard fate in his younger years, to serve one of our ambassadors [Horace Walpole] as his chaplain at a foreign court.

——— **Lee** (Henry) The Scripture doctrine of Atonement, vindicated from the misrepresentation of Dr. John Taylor of Norwich. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Cooke** (Thos.) The Scheme of Man's present and future existence; or the Doctrine of Universal salvation explained. 8vo. *Newcastle-on-Tyne.*

——— **Middleton** (Conyers, *D.D.*) An Essay on the allegorical and literal interpretation of the Creation and Fall of Man. 4to. *Lond.*

In vol 2 of his collected works, *Lond.*, 1755, 5 vols, 8vo.

1752—62. **Green** (John) Grace and Truth vindicated. 8vo. *Lond.*

The author was curate of Thurnscoe in Yorkshire,

1752. **Buttstett** (J. And.) Abschrift und vernunftmässige Gedanken von d. Freiheit des menschl. Willens in der Bekehrung. 8vo. *Wolfeub.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Trapps** (Joseph, *D.D.*) Sermons. 2 vols. 8vo. *Reading.*

Original Sin. The author was a clergyman of the Ch. of England, b. 1679, d, 1747.

——— **Brine** (John) The Causes of Salvation and Vocation considered in a Serm. 8vo. *Lond.*

The same year and place he published "The true sense of Atonement," 8vo.

——— **Whitefield** (G.) A Letter to Mr. J. W[esley] in answer to his sermon, intituled, free grace. 8vo.

——— [**Hugot** (Nic.)] Instructions sur les vérités de la Grace et de la Prédestination. 8vo. *Avignon.*

——— **Z.** (A.) A New Essay on Divine Providence wherein the Providence of God is asserted. pp. 126. 8vo. *Lond.*

Not apparently in B. M.

1752. **Fielding** (Henry) Examples of the Interposition of Providence in the detection and punishment of murder. *Lond.*

——— **Adams** (George) An exposition of some Articles of religion which strike at the tenets of the Arians and Socinians. Likewise at the Infidels, Romanists, Lutherans and Calvinists. 8vo. *Lond.*

10, Of Free Will—17, Of Predestination and Election.

——— **Warren** (Robert, *D.D.*) 52 Discourses. 4th ed. 3 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*

Vol 3, p. 405, On giving diligence in our election, &c.

This ed. not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Wautyer** (Peter) Theses Theologicæ de Gratia et libertate. pp. 89. 8vo. *Lovanii.*

Not in Brit. Mus.

Wantyer was Jesuit Prof. at Louvain.

[1752.] **Maister** (Joseph) Quæstiones theologicæ de Scientia Media reflexa, de Honorio Pontifice, de Prædestinatione ad gloriam, &c. *Græcii.*

1752. Dictionaire des livres Jansenistes, ou qui favourisent le Jansenisme. 4 vols. 12mo. *Antwerp.*

See 1654 and 1722.

1753. **Calcott** (A. J.) Sermons on the Election, the Sabbath, the Fall, and the Redemption. 8vo. *Lond.*

The 1st ed., *Brist.*, 1752, 8vo. Another ed., *Lond.*, 1767, 8vo.

——— Examen von het Ontwerp van Tolerantie am de leere in de Dordrechtse Synode met de Veroordeelde leere der remonstranten te Verenigen. 3 vols. *Amst.*

——— **Elphinston** (James) A Poetical Version of the younger Racine's Poem of Redemption.

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Regis** (Balthasar, *D.D.*) Discourse concerning the original account of the marvellous and most comfortable work of Men's Redemption. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Cortianus** (Jo. Bapt.) Dissertatio de Divinis Nominibus. 4to. *Vien.*

Not in the Brit Mus.

——— **Hervey** (James) Theron and Aspasio, in a series of Dialogues and Letters on the most important subjects. 3 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*

Reprinted several times, 1802, 2 vols, 8vo; 1837, 8vo. The author was Curate of Dummer, Hampshire, about 1736, and held the livings of Weston-Favel and Collingtree about 1752. He was a Calvinist.

[1753.] The great Love and Tenderness of God to his creature Man, or the Scripture Account of the Redemption, Conversion and Salvation of all mankind, &c. pp. xxiii, 344. 8vo. *Lond*

1753. **Duchal** (James) A Sermon on God's moral government. 8vo. *Lond.*

The 3rd vol. of his collected Sermons (2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1765, 8vo), has several discourses on the sovereignty of God. "A very rational and judicious composition."—*Dr. Kippis.* Duchal was an Irish nonconformist divine, settled successively at Cambridge, Antrim, and Dublin.

——— **L'Estrange** (Hamond) Essays on the being of a God and his governing and preserving Providence. pp. viii, 111. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Richardson** (J.) The beauty of Providence in bringing together the rich and the poor. A serm. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— An Essay on the Mosaic Account of the Creation and Fall of Man. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Buttstett** (J. And.) Abhandlung von der Gnadenwahl. 8vo. *Wolfen.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Wautyer** (Peter) Theses Theologicæ de gratia per se efficaci et libertate. pp. 62. 8vo. *Lovanii.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— ——— Theses Theologicæ de gratia et libertate ab objectionibus vindicatæ. pp. 56. 8vo. *Lovanii.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Shuckford** (Sam., *D.D.*) A Discourse on the Creation and Fall of Man. 8vo. *Lond.*

Recent ed., by J. T. Wheeler, 1858, 2 vols, 8vo. The author was Preb. of Canterbury, and Rector of All Hallows, *Lond.* He d. 1754. Transl. into French, *Leyden*, 1738, 2 vols, 8vo; *Paris*, 1752, 3 vols, 8vo. See Spicilegium Schuckfordiarum, an attack on the above work, and Bishop Garnett's Job, attributed to Bishop Horne, 1754, 8vo.

——— **Hussey** (Christopher, *D.D.*) 12 Sermons. 8vo. *Lond.*

p. 89, The foreknowledge of God; p. iii, The state of Man in Paradise (2 serm.) The author was Rector of West Wickham, Kent.

——— **Wilson** (Sam.) Sermons. 8vo. *Lond.*

p. 1, The doctrine of Efficacious grace asserted and vindicated (2 serm.) Another separate publication of these, 1773, 12mo; p. 190, On the final perseverance of the saints. The author was a Baptist minister, d. 1750.

——— **Lhotsky** (Geo.) Doctrina theolog. de gratia, Justificatione, merito, virtutibus, vitiis et peccatis. 4to. *Pragæ.*

The author who d. in 1758, was a Jesuit, and this work is against Jansenism, see De Backer vi, 275.

——— [**Clayton** (Robert, *Bishop of Clogher*)] Some thoughts on Self Love, Freewill, Liberty, and Necessity, &c. pp. 66. 8vo. *Dublin.*

Occasioned by reading Mr. Hume's works. The author says if one or other have to be given up, it would seem to be much more reasonable to give up the Foreknowledge of God than to impeach or doubt about the Freedom of Man, or the Justice of God, p. 28.

1753. **Stith** (Will.) The Nature and extent of Christ's Redemption. A Serm. 8vo. *Williamsbury* [*U.S.*]

The author was an American minister, Pres. of William and Mary Coll. See *Allibone* ii, 2264.

——— **Appleton** (Nathaniel, *D.D.*) How God wills the salvation of all men. A Serm. 8vo. *Boston* [*U.S.*]

——— **Bieruma** (Joannes) *Resp.* Disputatio philosophica de necessario, æterno et immutabili Dei decreto, non confundendo cum Spinozistico ordine æterno. 4to. *Trajecti ad Rhenum.*

1754. **Edwards** (Jonathan) A Careful and strict Enquiry into the modern prevailing notion of that Freedom of the Will which is supposed to be essential to moral agency, virtue and vice, reward and punishment, praise and blame. 8vo. *Boston* (*U. S.*)

Numerous editions, *Lond.*, 1762, 8vo; 1768, 8vo; 1816, 8vo; 1831, 12mo [by I. Taylor]; 1855, 8vo; *Liverpool*, 1877, 8vo. Also in Works by Rev. S. Hopkins, 1818, 8 vols, roy. 8vo. The author was President of New Jersey College, Princeton. "Edward's Inquiry," says Orme, "displays the talents of the author as a metaphysician, and his accurate knowledge of the Arminian and Calvinistic controversy." He is one of the most strenuous defenders of the doctrine of Predestination, both upon philosophical and christian principles. Sir James Mackintosh asserts that the English Calvinists have produced nothing to be put in competition with it, and he might have added neither have the Calvinists of any other country.

The work has been examined in a masterly way by Tappan, an American writer, and the Introd. Essay by Isaac Taylor to an Edition of the work in *Lond.*, 1831, 8vo, deserves especial attention, particularly as it established the editor's claims to rank among the most accomplished metaphysical writers of this day. Mr. Taylor says, "The treatise on the Will is to a true philosophy of human nature as the demonstrations of Leibnitz are to modern mechanical science." Edwards also pub. a Serm. entitled "True Grace distinguished from the experience of Devils," 1752.

——— **Hulsemannus** (Jo.) Calvinismus in Agone ac Fides actualis Infantium defensa. 8vo. *Alm.*

——— [**Horne** (Geo.)] Spicilegium Shuckfordianum. 4to. *Lond.*

(The Fall of Man.)
As to author see 1753 and 1775.

——— **Mason** (John) The Lord's Day evening entertainment.
2nd ed. 4 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*

Vol 3, The Nature of Assurance, and the way to attain it.

Vol 4, The covenant of grace opened and explained.

——— **Sharp** (John, *Archbp. of York*) Works. 7 vols. 12mo. *Lond.*

Vol 6, p. 301, Making our calling and election sure.

Another ed., 1829, *Oxf.*, 5 vols, 8vo. The 1st ed. of the 6th vol seems to have been pub. in 1734.

1754. **Liebrecht** (Christian) Prædestinatio non volentis neque currentis hominis, sed Miserentis Dei opus cum parergis dogmaticæ theologiæ.
4to. *Bambergæ.*

——— **Schubert** (Jo. Ernest) Gedanken von der Gnadenwahl. 4to. *Jenæ.*

——— **Zanchus** (Jos.) De gratia salutari.
4to. *Viennæ Austriæ.*

——— **B** (J.) A moral discourse on the attributes of God. By a Layman.
8vo. *Lond.*

——— Die gute sache gottes bey zurechnung des falles. 8vo. *Hildburg.*

——— **Plitt** (Jo. Jac.) Der rettung der ebre gottes bey der zurechnung des sündenfalls unserer stammeltern.
8vo. *Hamburg.*

——— **Premonteval.** Pensées sur la Liberté. 8vo. *Berl.*

——— **Brine** (John) The proper eternity of the divine decrees asserted. A Discourse. 8vo, *Lond.*

——— **Wesley** (John) An answer to all which the Rev. Dr. Gill has printed on the final Perseverance of the Saints.
pp. 12. 12mo. *Lond.*

[In verse.]
To this Dr. Gill replied in another Poem entitled "Perseverance," *Lond.*, 1755, 8vo.

1755. **Fortunatus a Brixia**, Jansenii Systema de Gratia, methodice expositum et theologice confutatum.
4to. *Matriti.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Jortin** (John, *D.D.*) Six Dissertations upon Different Subjects. 8vo.

Dis. 1, On the doctrine of divine assistance and human liberty.

Dis. 2, On the controversy concerning predestination and grace. The author was a Fellow of Jesus Coll, Camb., Rector of St. Dunstan's in the East, Lond., 1751; Vicar of Kensington; Preb. of St. Paul's, 1763; and Archdeacon of London, 1764. The above Dissertations are learned and valuable. Another ed., *Lond.*, 1809, pp. 245, 8vo.

——— Dictionnaire des livres Jansenistes ou qui favorisent le Jansénisme.
4 vols. 12mo. *Anvers.*

——— **Hussey** (Christ., *D.D.*) Twenty Sermons. 8vo. *Lond.*

p. 71, The sovereignty of God.
p. 93, The Divine Providence.
p. 117, The Providence of God.
p. 159, The reasons of good and evil.
p. 409, The origin of evil.

——— **Villette** (C. L. de) Dissertation sur l'Origine de Mal. 8vo. *Dublin.*

——— **Maud** (John) The Doctrine of Endless Torments.....with a Discussion on the Origin of Evil. 8vo.

——— Du Hazard sous l'Empire de la Providence. 8vo. *Berl.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

1755. **Besse** (Joseph) The Universality of God's love—also an Enquiry into the Scriptural significations of the words Election, Elect, Reprobate. 8vo. *Lond.*

Rare.

1756. **Witte** (Gilles de) Nouvelle apologie de la Sainte doctrine de Jansenius touchant les V propositions, &c. 12mo. *Rome* [*Amsterdam?*]

2nd ed.

——— **Sandeman** (Rob.) Letters on Theron and Aspasio. 2 vols. 12mo. *Edin.*

Other ed., 1768; and *Edinb.*, 1803, 2 vols, 12mo. For works on the controversy see Lowndes' Brit. Lib.; 760—761.

——— **Kilner** (James) Serm. on the perpetual inter-agency of Providence in all things. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Pleyer** (Joseph) An ex dæmonum damnatorumque peccatis Jansenius bene intulerit, liberum Arbitrium cum simplici necessitate consistere. 4to. *Pragæ.*

The author was a Jesuit, who died in 1799.

——— **Schmitth** (Nicolas) Tractatus de Divina Gratia. 4to. *Tyrnaviæ.*

Another ed., 1762. The author was a Jesuit Prof. of philosophy and theology, and Chancellor of the Univ. at Tyrnau. He d. in 1767.

——— **Bilstone** (John) Serm.; Grace considered in its operation on the understanding, the will, and the affections. 8vo. *Oxf.*

——— **Burch** (Thos.) The free grace of God displayed in the salvation of men. 2 Essays. 8vo. *Lond.*

"At the request of the worthy author of the following Essays, I have perused them; and observe nothing in them but what is agreeable to the Sacred Scriptures, to the form of sound words, to the analogy of the Faith, and the doctrine of the Gospel."—*Dr. Gill.*

——— **Sykes** (Arthur Ashley, *D.D.*) The Scripture Doctrine of the Redemption of Man by Jesus Christ. 8vo. *Lond.*

There seems to have been an ed. in 1755, 8vo. The author was Preb. of Salisbury, 1723, and Precentor, 1726; Dean of St. Burien, Cornwall, 1737; and Preb. of Winchester, 1740, d. 1756. The above work is recommended by Bp. Wilson as one of his best. He was a divine of the school of Clarke and Hoadly.

——— **Smith** (J.) A clear and comprehensive view of the Being, Nature, and Attributes of God. 8vo. *Oxf.*

——— **Williams** (J.) Awful Providences, calls to repentance. A Serm. 8vo. *Lond.*

Also author of "The Favours of Providence to Britain in 1759," a serm., *Lond.*, 1759, 8vo. The author was a dissenting minister.

1757. **Browne** (Arthur) The doctrine of Election fairly stated in a Serm. 8vo. *Portsmouth* [*U. S.*]

——— **Wesley** (John) The doctrine of Original Sin according to the Scripture, Reason, and Experience. 8vo. *Brist.*

In reply to John Taylor of Norwich.

——— **Fleming** (Caleb) A letter to the ingenious author of a Free Inquiry into the Nature and Origin of Evil. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Stebbing** (Henry) A Discourse on the Governing Providence of God. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Niles** (Samuel) The True Scripture Doctrine of Original Sin.

In answer to Dr. Taylor's work on this subject. The author was minister of Braintree, Mass., U.S.

——— **Whitfield** (Peter) The Christianity of the New Testament, or a Scholastic defence of the Scripture doctrine of Redemption, &c. 8vo. *Liverpool.*

Another ed., *Liverpool* [1757], 4to. The copy of this last ed. in the Brit. Mus. is imperfect, wanting all after p. xl of the Preface.

——— **Troschel** (Jac. Elias) De æterna Peccatorum Damnatione speciatim ex Scientia Dei media demonstrata. 4to. *Halæ.*

——— **Jenyns** (Soame) A Free Inquiry into the nature and origin of Evil. 12mo. *Lond.*

Another ed., 1758, 8vo.

"Johnson's most exquisite critical essay in the Literary Magazine, and indeed anywhere, is his review of Soame Jenyns's Inquiry into the Origin of Evil."—*Boswell's Life of Johnson.* Some have styled this review the best of all Johnson's writings.—Johnson published it separately; see further The Idler, No. 89, Dec. 29, 1759. Green in his Diary of a Lover of Literature says of the above work, "extremely ingenious, and wretchedly unsatisfactory—with all its paradoxical ingenuity, there appears to me only two truly original thoughts in this work," 8vo. Jenyns was an M.P., and d. 1787. His works were coll., *Lond.*, 1792, 4 vols, 8vo, 2nd ed.

——— **Rubeis** (Jo. F. Bern, M. de) De Peccato originali ejusque natura, &c. 4to. *Venet.*

Another ed.. *Wirceb.*, 1857, 8vo.

1758. **Foster** (James, *D.D.*) The doctrine of a particular Providence considered. 8vo.

——— **Ales de Corbet** (P. Alex. de) De l'Origine du Mal, ou examen des principales difficultés de Bayle sur cette matière, &c. 2 tom. 12mo. *Paris.*

——— **Pike** (Sam.) Saving Grace. 8vo.

The author was a dissenting divine, succeeded John Hill at the Three Cranes, London.

——— **Clark.** — On the unsearchable Nature of Providence. A Dis. 8vo.

In "Protestant System," vol 2. The author was a dissenting minister.

1758. **Clark** (Peter) The Scripture Doctrine of Original sin. 8vo. *Boston* [*Mass.*]

Also author of "Man's dignity and duty as a reasonable creature and his insufficiency as a fallen creature," a serm., *Boston* [*Mass.*], 1763, 8vo.

——— **Bally** (George) The Providence of the Supreme Being, a poem. 4to.

Other ed., 1772, 8vo; 1773, 8vo; 1787, 8vo.

——— The Opinion of one that has perused the Summer Morning's conversation concerning Original Sin, wrote by P. Clark. 12mo. *Boston* [*Mass.*]

——— **Davies** (Sam.) Serm., Rom. ix, 22, 23: The vessels of mercy and the vessels of wrath, delineated in a new, uncontroverted and practical light. 8vo. *Lond.*

Reprinted in vol 2, p. 274, of Sermons, *New York*, 1851, 8vo, 3 vols.

——— **Green** (John) 8 Sermons. 4to. *Lond.*

The state of Adam in Innocence—his fall—abuse of free will, and the entrance of Original Sin.

——— **Redelhamer** (Joseph) Institutiones Scholasticæ: Tractatus de Gratia Christi. 4to. pp. 434. *Vien.*

The author was a Jesuit prof. of philosophy at Laitz, Gratz, and at Vienna, and d. in 1761.

——— **Edwards** (Jonathan) The great Christian doctrine of Original Sin defended. 8vo. *Boston* [*U.S.*]

Other ed., *Worcester* [*U.S.*] [1760], 8vo; *Lond.*, 1766, 8vo; 1774, 8vo; *Glasgow*, 1768, 12mo; *Boston* [*U. S.*] 1789, 8vo; *Edinb.*, 1798, 8vo. Also in Works, 1818, 8 vols, roy. 8vo. It is said that even Dr. John Taylor of Norwich, against whom it was written, acknowledged that he was defeated.

——— **Hayward** (Samuel) Sermons. 8vo. *Lond.*

(*Original Sin.*)

——— **Hussey** (Christopher, *D.D.*) On the Wisdom of God in the Redemption of Mankind. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Bellamy** (Jos.) Serm. on .....The Wisdom of God in the permission of sin. 8vo. *Boston* [*Mass.*]

Another ed., *Northampton*, 1783, 8vo; *Morris-Town* [*U. S.*] 1804, pp. 130, 12mo; *Boston* [*U. S.*] 1760, 12mo. The author d. 1790.

1759. ——— An attempt to point out the fatal consequences of the Rev. M. J. Bellamy's doctrine respecting moral evil. pp. 130. 12mo. *Boston* [*U.S.*]

——— **Bellamy** (Jos.) Theron Paulinas and Aspasio; or letters and Dialogues upon.....assurance to eternal life. 12mo. *Boston* [*U.S.*]

Another ed., *Lond.*, 1761, 12mo; *Glasgow*, 1792, pp. 240, 12mo; *London*, *Dunstable* [*printed*], 1806, 8vo.

——— **Edwards** (Thos., *D.D.*) The doctrine of Irresistible Grace proved to have no foundation in the writings of the New Test. 8vo. *Camb.*

The author was an Arminian divine, Fellow of Clare Hall, Camb.; Vicar of Nuneaton, Warwickshire, in 1770, d. 1785: "A very accurate and learned performance, which does great honour to my ingenious friend, the worthy author."—*Dr. Harwood.* Dr. Harwood was probably somewhat biassed in his judgment by his friendship, but his conclusion is sounder than that of Mr. Orme in his *Bibl. Bib.*, p. 166. Edwards in the above work pursued the plan which had been adopted by Clarke on the Trinity and Hoadly on the Sacraments, of arranging every text of Scripture that was supposed to relate to the point in question. In his 3rd chapter he shows that the Calvinistic tenet of irresistible grace does not receive the least countenance from the texts he has arranged, nor from any other text in Holy Writ. He displays a critical mind, and his work is a candid inquiry after truth, certainly a valuable addition to the Calvinist and Arminian controversy.

1759. **Peckard** (Peter) The Nature of Christ's Redemption. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Lavington** (John R.) An humble Inquiry into the nature of the Gospel offer, Faith, and Assurance. 12mo. *Lond.*

——— **Zimmermann** (John James) Opuscula theologici historici et philosophici argumenti. 2 vols. 4to. *Tiguri.*

Vol 2, pt. 2, p. 977, De Fato Stoicorum. The author was Prof. of Theology in the Univ. of Zurich, and d. 1756.

——— **Flatt** (J. J.) Meletem. de imputat. peccati Adamitici, &c. *Tub.*

——— **Shepherd** (Richard, *D.D.*) Review of a Free inquiry into the Origin and Nature of Evil. 8vo.

The author was Archdeacon of Bedford, 1783; and Rector of Wetherden and Helmingham, Suffolk, d. 1809.

1760. **Pike** (Sam.) Free Grace indeed. 12mo.

——— **Gregson** (Moses) The faith of God's Elect. A Sermon. *Lond.*

——— **Hervey** (Jas.) Theron and Aspasio defended against the letters on Theron and Aspasio. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Nanninga** (G. R.) Dissert. Philos. Theolog. explicans Naturam corruptionis Moralis. 4to. *Groning.*

——— **Dodwell** (William) Particular Providence stated. 8vo. *Oxford.*

Not in the B. M.

The author was Rector of Shottesbrooke, Vicar of Bucklesbury, Prebendary of Salisbury, and Archdeacon of Berks.

——— **Bowen** (Sam.) A Series of discourses. 4 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*

Vol 2, On Providence.

2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1768. Bowen was a dissenting minister at Norwich.

——— SS. Prosperi et Leonis Notarii de Gratia, de Libero Arbitrio et de Prædestinatione opera. 8vo. *Paris.*

1760. An essay towards demonstrating the immateriality and free agency of the Soul, in answer to Strutt and Collins. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Stevenson** (William) Familiar letters on free agency. pp. 144. 8vo. *Lond.*

The author was Prebendary of Sarum.

[1760.] **Clarke** (Rich.) A Vindication of the honour of God in a Scriptural refutation of the doctrines of Eternal misery and universal Salvation. 8vo.

"A very elaborate work."—*Dr. Kippis.*

1760. **Pleyer** (Joseph) Dissertatio de libertate ad peccandum in damnatis. *Pragæ.*

——— **Bewicke** (Wilson) The State of Grace illustrated from nature. A Serm. 8vo. *Lond.*

[1760.] **Brown** (John) The Saint's Triumph, and the Devil's Downfall. 8vo. *Norwich.*

On Election, Reprobation, and Free Will.

1760. **Oulton** (J.) A Vindication of the 17th Article. 8vo.

Mostly against "the aspersions cast on it," in a sermon by John Wesley.

1761. **Edwards** (Thos.) Free and Candid Thoughts on the Doctrine of Predestination. 8vo. *Lond.*

A second ed. under the title "The Scripture Doctrine of Predestination explained and vindicated," *Lond.*, 1762, 8vs.

The author was a Barrister of Lincoln's Inn.

——— A Conference between a Mystic and Hutchinsonian, a Calvinist, and others, etc. 8vo.

——— **Stonhouse** (Sir Geo.) Universal Restitution. pp. 466. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **[Edmonds** (John)] An illustration of the wisdom and equity of an indulgent Providence, in a similar treatment of all creatures on this globe, wherein the nature and ground of happiness, and also the origin of evil, are carefully examined and represented. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— Reflections upon Liberty and Necessity.

This work was privately printed and is very rare. "Whether these sentiments coincide or not with those of any other person living or dead, is a matter of utter indifference to him (the author). No copy of them shall with his consent be sold." The work contains "Cursory remarks upon Dr. Clarke's answer to Mr. Collins's inquiry concerning Human Liberty."

——— **Wallace** (Robt., *D.D.*) Various prospects of Mankind, Nature and Providence. pp. viii. 406. 8vo. *Lond.*

This work has some observations both on Burnet's Theory (1681) and Keil's Examination of it, deserving of attention. It is considered by Dr. Parr (see Biblio. Parriana, by G. Bohn, 460) and reviewed by Sir T. N. Talford in Retrosp. Rev. ii, 185. Some of Wallace's views have since been urged by Godwin, Morgan, Thompson, Owen and others. The work is not under Wallace in the B. M. cat.

1761. **Glas** (John) Works. 4 vols. 8vo. *Edin.*

Vol 2. Predestination impugned and defended, and remarks on Dr. Benson's doct. of predestination reviewed.—Vol 3. Predestination—The Fall of Man and the true grace of God. Another ed., *Perth and Dundee*, 1782, 5 vols, 8vo. This second edition is in the Brit. Mus., but the first is not. The author was a Scotch Divine, a native of Dundee and founder of the Glassites, afterwards called from his son-in-law Robert Sandeman, Sandemanians, see Wilson's Hist. of Dissent. Churches. He d. 1773.

——— **Newcombe** (Rich.) Sermons on Rom. ix., 26. 4to. *Lond.*

The author was Canon of Windsor and Bishop of Llandaff, 1754, trans. to St. Asaph, 1761. He d. 1769.

1762. **Riccaltoun** (Robt.) Inquiry into the spirit and tendency of Letters on Theron and Aspasio. 12mo. *Edinb.*

Riccaltoun was a minister of the Ch. of Scotland, b. 1691, d. 1769. Mr. John Newton of London speaks of him as a masterly writer.

——— **Haweis** (Thos.) Evangelical principles and practice. 8vo. *Lond.*

Treats of man's state of Innocence, corruption of human nature and redemption. Another ed., *Oxf.*, 1835, 12mo. Haweis was Rector of Aldwinckle, and Chaplain to the Countess of Huntingdon. He d. 1810.

The work is of little value.

——— **Racine** (Bonaventure) Abrégé de l'histoire Ecclésiastique, contenant les événemens considérables de chaque siécle avec des réflexions. 13 vols. 4to. *Cologne.*

Vol 2. Histoire des cinq propositions.

——— **Vitringa** (Campegius) Doctrina Christianæ religionis, per aphorismos summatim descripta. 6th ed., 9 vols. 4to. *Arnheimæ.*

Vol. 2. De consilio Divinæ voluntatis; de creatione, Providentia, Statu integritatis, Lapsu, Peccati pœnis, Peccati originali. Vol 3, De testamento gratiæ de fide, vocatione et perseverantia Sanctorum. The author was one of the most learned and elaborate Dutch theologians. Prof. of Divinity and Eccles. Hist. in the University of Franeker., b. 1659, d. 1722. A portion only of the above ed. is in the Brit. Mus. The earlier ed., *Franequeræ*, 1714, 8vo, in 2 parts is there.

His "Dissertationes Sacræ," *Franeq.*, 1731, pp. 640, 4to, contains "De natura peccati," etc.

——— **Gerbert** (Mart.) De radiis divinitatis in operibus naturæ, providentiæ et gratiæ. 3 vols. 8vo. *S. Blasii.*

——— **Conradi** (Jos.) Tractatus theologicus de gratia justificatione et merito. 4to. *Olomucii.*

Not in Brit. Mus.

The author was a Jesuit; and died at Brunn, 1767.

——— **Zaccaria** (Francis Ant.) Thesaurus Theologicus. 13 vols. 4to. *Venet.*

Vol 2, p. 199. De Deo Prædestinante Opus 1 Jac. Sermondi Historia Prædestinatiana: p. 220, Natalis Alexandri dissertatio de Prædestinatiana

hæresi: p. 235, Natalis Alexandri dissertatio de causa Gotescalchi: p. 715, Opuscula duo Laurentii Brancata Basilicæ, S.S. XII. Apostolorum, S. R. E. Presbyt. Card. de Laurea Bibliothecarii de Deo quoad Opera Prædestinationis et Reprobationis—Opusculum, 1, De Prædestinatione; p. 803, Opus. 2, De Reprobatione malorum; vol. 4, p. 249, De libero, arbitrio hominis ad peccandum; vol. 5 has several works on Grace and Freewill.

1762. **Brine** (John) The Right to Eternal Glory.....proved to be consistent with absolute freedom and sovereignty of Divine Grace, as the origin of it. 8vo. *Lond.*

Also author of "Some mistakes in a book of Mr. Johnson's of Liverpool, entitled 'The faith of God's elect,'—noted and rectified." *Lond.*, 1755, 8vo.

——— **Vitry** (Edouard de) Conclusiones theologicæ de Gratia Dei et Libero hominis Arbitrio. 4to.

In Thesaurus Theologicus, etc., tom 5.

1763. **Rotheram** (John) A Serm. on the Wisdom of Providence in the Administration of the World. 8vo. *Oxf.*

——— **Barker** (John) Sermons. 2 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*

Vol 1, 3. On Divine Providence.

The 1st ed. of the Sermons in 1 vol, *Lond.*, 1748, 8vo.

——— **Busaeus** (Chas.) Theses de peccato, gratia, justificatione et merito propugnatæ ab. A. Müller. pp. 12. 4to. *Bambergæ.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

The author was a Jesuit, chancellor of the University of Bamberg and Rector of the College. He d. 1782.

——— [**Patouillet** (L.)] Histoire de Pélagianisme. 2 pts. pp. 252, 202. 12mo. *Avignon.*

Another ed. 1767, pp. xix, 400, 439, 12mo. Patouillet the Jesuit signed the dedicatory Epistle to Clement XIII, in this last edition. The work was translated into Italian, *Romæ*, 1765, 2 vols, pp. xxiv, 249, 245, 12mo; and again, *Assisi*, 1783, 2 vols, 8vo. The author, who died 1770, was the writer of Les progres du Jansenisme, par Frere Lacroix, *Ouila*, 1753, 12mo.

——— **Towers** (Jos.) A Review of the genuine doctrines of christianity. 8vo. *Lond.*

Treats of the principal Calvinistic doctrines, and has observations on Free Agency, &c. The author was a minister of a Dissenting Chapel at Highgate, and in 1778, forenoon preacher at a Chapel in Newington Green. He d. 1799. He was an Arian.

——— **Mac Ewen** (William) Grace and Truth. 12mo. *Lond.*

Often reprinted, last ed. by MacNeile, 1840, fp. 8vo. "An exhibition of pure evangelical truth in very pleasant language."—*John Burns of Whitburn.*

The author was a minister of the seccession Church of Scotland at Dundee. D. 1762.

——— **Chandler** (Sam.) Answer to Wesley's Letter to the Bp. of Gloucester. 8vo. *Lond.*

Concerning Grace.

1763. **Search** (Ed.) [**Tucker** (Abr.)] Freewill, Foreknowledge, and Fate. A Fragment. pp. 268. 8vo. *Lond.*

Full of original ideas, put with peculiar quaintness.

——— **Andrews** (John) The Scripture Doctrine of Grace. 8vo. *Lond.*

This is an answer to Bp. Warburton's Doctrine of Grace. 2nd ed., 1769, 12mo. For some curious letters between Warburton and Andrews, see Nichols' Literary Anec., Vol. 5, 620. Andrews was vicar of Marden.

——— **Hey** (John, *D.D.*) Essay on Redemption, a Seatonian Prize Poem. 4to. *Lond.*

Other ed., 1772, 1773, 1787, 1808, all 8vo. The author was first Norrisian Prof. of Divinity, 1780-95. Bp. Kaye calls him "one of the most acute, impartial and judicious divines of modern times."

——— **Scott** (James, *D.D.*) The Redemption, a Monody. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Gazzaniga** (P. M.) De Deo ejusque Proprietatibus. 8vo. *Vindob.*

Another ed., same place, 1770, 3 vols, 8vo.

——— **Whitefield** (Geo.) Observations on some fatal mistakes in "The Doctrine of Grace," [Warburton's]. 12mo. *Lond.*

This ed. in the B. M. is imperfect, wanting all after page 24. 4th ed., *Lond.*, 1763, 12mo; *Lond. and Edinb.*, 1764, 8vo.

The author was the celebrated Dissenter, d. 1770. He wrote also a Serm. on "God's free grace in the conversion of Sinners."—*Lond.* 1740, 8vo.

——— **Rutherforth** (Thos., *D.D.*) Four charges to the clergy of the Archdeaconry of Essex. 8vo. *Camb.*

3. An examination of the doctrine of the Methodists concerning assurance. The author was Regius Prof. of Divinity at Camb., 1745; Rector of Barrow in Suffolk, Shenfield in Essex, and Basley in Herts., and in 1753 Archdeacon of Essex. He d. 1771.

——— **Wigglesworth** (Edw., *D.D.*) The Doctrine of Reprobation briefly considered. Lectures. 8vo. *Boston* [*U. S.*]

1764. **Witherspoon** (John, *D.D.*, *LL.D.*) Essays on Important subjects intended to establish the Doctrine of Salvation by Grace. 3 vols. 12mo. *Lond.*

In the Brit. Mus. catalogue, 2 vols only, and dated 1765. Another ed. at *Bungay*, 1800, 8vo, 2 vols. The author was President of New Jersey Coll., America, d. 1794, aged 73. He was a Universal scholar and profound theologian.

——— **Gravina** (Guiseppe Maria) De Electorum Hominum Numero respectu Hominum Reproborum. *Panormi.*

——— **Ogilvie** (John, *D.D.*) Providence; an allegorical poem in 3 books. 4to. *Lond.*

1764. [**Lawson** (John)] Occasional Sermons written by a late eminent divine of the Church of England. 8vo. *Lond.*

P. 254. Providence of God the sole Guide of human affairs. The author was senior Tutor and Prof. of Oratory in Trin. Coll., Dublin. Other ed. of the above sermons, 1765, 8vo; and 1776, 8vo.

"It is surprising that sermons possessing such originality of thought, splendour of diction, knowledge of human nature, and forcible appeals to the heart, should not have been reprinted."—*Samuel Clapham.*

——— **Stronge** (James) Providential History of Mankind. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Spagnio** (Andrea) De causa efficiente.—Dissertatio. 4to. *Romæ.*

The author was a Jesuit.

——— **Whitewood** (Thos.) The Free Grace of God Displayed in the hearts of his people, etc. 8vo. *Lond.*

These are remarks on a pamphlet by Pike, styled "Free Grace Indeed."

1765. **Freeman** (W.) Against Calvinism. 8vo.

——— **Bligh** (Michael) The Grace of God. 8vo.

——— **Hervey** (Jas.) Eleven Letters to John Wesley in answer to his Remarks on Theron and Aspasio. 8vo. *Lond.*

See Tegg's edition of Theron and Aspasio, 1837, 8vo.

——— **Wirthgen** (C. F.) Prædestinatio Malorum pœnarum præsertim apud Inferos non æternarum contra Basedoviam negatur. 4to. *Viteb.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

Basedow's work intitled, "Philalethie," was published in 1763, *Altona*, 8vo.

——— Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum, antiquorumque scriptorum ecclesiasticorum, studio Andreæ Gallandii. 14 vols. fol. *Venet.*

Vol. 9, p. 63. Paulli Orosii opera. Apologeticus contra Pelagium de arbitrii libertate.—see 1615.

Vol. 10, p. 357. Prædestinatus sive prædestinatorum hæresis, et Sirmondi historia prædestinatiana.

Vol. 13, p. 553. Amulonis Lugdunensis epistolæ, et opuscula duo de præscientia et prædestinatione.

See 1649, 1643 and 1649.

——— Joseph ab Expectatione Systema theologicum ad mentem S. Anselmi. pp. xii and 458. 4to. *Conimbr.*

Contains "De præsentia Dei de prædestinatione, de div. Gratiæ efficacitate, de libero arbitrio, aliæ quæst. S. Anselmi.

——— **Charmes** (Th.) De Incarnatione et gratia. pp. 430. *Aug. V.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Lloyd** (Peirson) Sermons. 8vo. *Lond.*

p. 137. Against the intemperate curiosity of prying into the secrets of God, with a particular application of the doctrine to some of the chief articles of the Christian faith. The author was second master of Westminster School, subsequently Archdeacon of York. "Plain Practical Sermons."—*Crit. Rev.*

1765. **Rupp** (Joh.) Exegesis Axioma, tis theologici Facienti quod est in se-Deus non denegat gratiam. Quam cum annexis positionibus de Peccatis, Gratia, Justificatione et Merito ad majorem Dei Tri-unius gloriam Dei paræ sine omni macula Conceptæ honorem, præsidæ R. P. Joanne Rupp, S.J. 4to. pp. 16. *Heidelb.*

——— Conclusiones theologicæ de Prædestinatione, etc. fol. *Terni.*

——— **Jacobi** (J. F.) Betrachtungen über die weisen Absichten Gottes, &c. 8vo. *Hanov.*

——— **Penny** (Stephen) Letters on the Fall and Restoration of Mankind. 8vo. *Bristol.*

Another ed., *Lond.*, 1851, 8vo.

1766. **Edwards** (Jonathan) History of the Work of Redemption. 8vo.

Other ed., *Lond.*, 1771, 1778; *New York*, 1786, 8vo; which is the first ed. in the B. M.; *Lond.*, 1788, 1791, 8vo; *Edinb.*, 1774, 8vo. The edition of 1788 with notes by Dr. E. Williams is considered the best. Also in works 1818, 8 vols, roy. 8vo.

Edited by David Austin, 1793, 8vo. *New York*, 1793, 8vo, stated, but inaccurately in the Brit. Mus. catalogue, to be the first American ed. *Edin.*, 1799, 12mo: *Lond.*, 1812, 8vo; *Edinb.*, 1816, 12mo; 1819, 8vo; *Lond.*, 1831, 1835, 8vo; 12mo; *New York*, [1850 ?] 8vo; *Lond.*, [1872] 8vo. In French, *Toulouse*, 1854, 8vo.

——— **Broughton** (Thomas) The true Scripture doctrine of .....the extent of the Christian redemption. p. 174. 8vo. *Bristol.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Richie** (James, *M.D.*) The peculiar doctrines of Revelation relating to Piacular sacrifices, Redemption, etc. 2 vols. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Berrow** (Capel) A lapse of souls, in a state of pre-existence, the only original sin, and ground work of the Gospel dispensation. 8vo. *Lond.*

Author of "A pre-existent lapse of human souls demonstrated from reason."—*Lond.*, 1762, 8vo.

——— **Knight** (Titus) Sermons on important subjects, with a treatise on the imputation of sin and of righteousness. 8vo. *Leeds.*

P. 1. Original sin (2 serm.)
P. 169. The saint's perseverance.

——— **Sharpe** (Gregory, *LL.D.*) The want of universality no objection to the Christian religion. 8vo. *Lond.*

The author was Master of the Temple. D. 1771, but best known for his arguments in Defence of Christianity, *Lond.*, 1755, 8vo; 1762, 8vo.

——— **Webb** (Francis) Sermons. 2 vols. 16mo. *Lond.*

Vol 1, p. 1. Man and the providence of God.

The author was Minister of a Baptist congregation, Barbican, London, also minister at Honiton. D. 1815.

1766. **Rotheram** (John) 3 Sermons. 8vo. *Lond.*
One on the wisdom of providence in the administration of the world.
The author was Fell. of Univ. Coll., Oxford, Rector of Houghton-le-Spring, and Vicar of Seaham, 1769. D. 1788.

——— **Lechner** (Ignatius) Status Quæstionis et Doctrinæ Fidei et Divina Gratia. Seculo Ecclesiæ primo cui subnexa Corollaria ex Tractatu de Peccatis et Gratia. Præside R. P. Ignatio Lechner, S.J. 4to. *Bambergæ.*

——— **Monschein** (Jos.) Theologia Dogmatico-Speculativa in prælectionibus publicis tradita. 8vo. *Aug. Vindel.*
Tract iii. De Peccatis, gratia et merito.
The author was a Jesuit, Prof. of Rhetoric, and Chancellor of the University of Dillingen.

——— **Wise** (Jos.) Providence written in 1764. 8vo. *Lond.*
Not in Brit. Mus.

——— **Amory** (Thos., *D.D.*) 22 Sermons. 8vo. *Lond.*
P. 153. The goodness of Divine Providence to mankind in particular; p. 185, Ditto to sinners: p. 215, Ditto in the Redemption of the world; p. 301, Of moral evil. Amory was a Protestant Dissenter, Pastor of the Society of the Old Jewry, 1766; one of the Commissioners for the enlargement of the Toleration Act. He d. 1774. He rejected rigid Calvinism, and was a divine of the school of Dr. Sam. Clarke. He was a sound Biblical critic and excellent scholar. See Dr. Flusman's *Life of Amory, and Biog. Brit.*, vol. 1.

——— **Rupp** (Joannes) Prælectiones Theologicæ. 8 vols. 8vo. *Heidelb.*
Vol. iii. De Peccato, Gratia, etc.

——— **Kirsch** (Leopold) Tractatus theologicus de gratia actuali et justificatione. 4to. *Pragæ.*
The author was a Jesuit teacher of philosophy and theology.

——— **Dixon** (Thos.) The Sovereignty of the Divine administration vindicated, with Pref. by Seddon. 8vo. *Lond.*
2nd ed., *Lond.* [1766?] 8vo.

1767. Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum. (see 1765).
Vol 3, p. 761. St. Methodii Liber de libero arbitrio.

——— **Price** (Richard, *D.D.*, *LL.D.*) Four Dissertations. 8vo. *Lond.*
One on Providence.
Other ed., *Lond.*, 1772, 1777; *Harlow*, 1811, 8vo.
The author was a Dissenting Minister, who d. 1791. See Gent. Mag., vol. 61, pt, 1, p. 389.

——— **Hartley** (J.) Trial of the two opinions.

——— **Continho.** De Peccato originali. 4to. *Conimbricæ.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Lechner** (Ignatius) Anacephalosis de peccatis et gratia cum corollariis de justificatione et merito. 4to. *Bambergæ.*

1767. **Schwab** (Joannes) Dissertatio philosophica de Deo existente, providente ac revelante contra Atheos, Fatalistas et Deistas. 8vo. *Badenæ.*
The author was a Jesuit, who d. 1795.

——— **Wiesner** (Geo. Franc.) Providentia Divina ex Ratione Naturali deducta. Disquisitio Philosophica quam cum selectis ex Logica et Metaphysica propositionibus D. O. M. Præs. G. W., S.J. pp. 93. 8vo. *Heidelb.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Dean** (Rich.) An Essay on the future life of Brutes, introduced with observations upon evil, its nature and origin. 2 vols. 8vo. *Manchester.*
2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1768, 8vo. The author was Curate of Middleton.

1768. **Adamson** (John) The Loss and Recovery of Elect Sinners. *Lond.*
Another ed., *Aberdeen*, 1780, sm. 8vo.
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Edwards** (Thos., *D.D.*) Duæ dissertationes. 8vo. *Cantabrigiæ.*
On Election and Predestination.—An able work, see Monthly Rev., xxxix. 503.

——— **Harwood** (Ed., *D.D.*) The Melancholy doctrine of Predestination exposed, and the delightful truth of Universal Redemption represented. 12mo. *Lond.*
The author was a learned Unitarian minister, and Schoolmaster, Pastor of a congregation in Bristol, June 1765 to 1770. He d. 1794.

——— **Search** (Ed.) [**Tucker** (Abr.)] The Light of Nature Pursued. 3 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*
2nd and best ed., 1805, 7 vols, 8vo. Several other ed., a good one, *Lond.*, 1837, 2 vols, 8vo. An abridged ed. [by Will. Hazlitt] 1807, 8vo. A most original and valuable work. "I have found in this writer more original thinking and observation upon the several subjects that he has taken in hand, than in any other, not to say, than in all others put together."—*Paley's Moral Phil.*

——— **Booth** (Abr.) The Reign of Grace from its rise to its consummation. 8vo. *Lond.*
Lond., 1771, 8vo; 1790, 12mo; 1795, 12mo; 1803, 12mo; *Liverpool*, 1808, 8vo; *Lond.*, [1810] 12mo; 1812, 8vo; *Derby*, 1817, 12mo; *Hartford* [*U. S.*] 1814, 8vo; *Edin.*, 1844, 16mo; in Works, 1813, 3 vols, 8vo.
"A masterly performance."—*Dr. E. Williams.*
It is a most powerful and luminous and comprehensive exposition of the dispensation of grace, "Clearness of Thought, nervous reasoning, accurate method, and vigour of style are its just characteristics."—*Ryland.*
An ed. with an intro. by Thos. Chalmer, *D.D.*, 1828, 12mo.
Booth was the greater part of his life of the sect of General Baptists, and held the doctrine of the universality of divine grace—in fact he wrote a work on "Absolute Predestination," in which he opposed the doctrine of Election. Later however he turned from his original views and embraced the tenets of Calvin. "The Reign of Grace," was written after his change of opinions.

1768. **Plancentia** (Stan. à Minor ref.) Consensus Augustini et Scoti de Gratia Christi. 2 vols. 4to. *Venet.*

Written with a view to the Jansenist Controversy, to shew that the Prince of Divines and the Prince of Logicians had equally orthodox opinions on this important doctrine.

——— Philosophical Essays. III. Of Liberty and Necessity. 8vo. *Edinb.*

———**Dryfhoud** (A.) De Providentia Dei speciali. 8vo. *Traj.*

Not in Brit. Mus.

——— [**Stonehouse** (Sir Geo.)] Universal Restitution further defended. pp. 148. 8vo. *Bristol.*

——— **Chandler** (Sam., *D.D.*) Sermons pub. from his MSS. by Thos. Amory. 4 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*

2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1769, 4 vols, 8vo.

Vol. 4. Original state and fall of man. The author was an eminent Dissenting Minister, a native of Berkshire, educated at Tewkesbury and at Leyden. In 1716 he had charge of a Presbyterian congregation at Peckham, and d. 1766, aged 73.

"There is a fulness of thought upon every subject which Dr. Chandler treats, as is rarely met with and shows a mind richly furnished."—*Monthly Rev.* It must be remembered he was an Arian. He was the author of a Serm. on "The necessary and immutable difference between moral good and evil," *Lond.*,1738, 8vo; another ed, in "Protestant System," vol 1, 1758, 8vo.

——— **Korner** (J. G.) Diss. hist. theol. de imagine divina. 4to. *Wittemb.*

——— **Shepherd** (Rich., *D.D.*) Letters to the author of a Free Inquiry into the Origin and Nature of Evil. 8vo. *Lond.*

2nd ed., 1773.

——— **Schram** (R. P. Domin.) Compendium Theologiæ 3 vols. 8vo. *August. Vindel.*

Vol 1, p. 127. De Deo, Divinisque ejus attributis; p. 364, De creatione hominis et ejus lapsu; p. 566, De Gratia Christi: vol 2, p. 1, De actibus humanis. A learned, valuable and rare work. The author was a Benedictine.

1769. **Toplady** (Aug. Mont.) The doctrine of Absolute Predestination stated and asserted.

Another ed., *Brist.*, 12mo; *New York*, 1773, 12mo; *Lond.*, 1815, 12mo; 1843, 12mo. In vol 5, collected works, *Lond.*, 1794, 8vo, 6 vols, where will also be found his Letter to Wesley, relative to his intended abridgment of Zanchius on Predestination, and "More work for Mr. John Wesley; or a vindication of the decrees and providence of God," also, "Thoughts on Perseverance." In vol 3, p. 165, is a discourse on "Freewill and merit fairly stated." The author was the gifted Vicar of Hembury, best known for his masterly work, "Historic proof of the doctrinal Calvinism of the Ch. of England."

——— [**Toplady** (Aug. Mont.) The Ch. of England vindicated from the charge of Arminianism. 8vo. *Lond.*

This is a letter to Dr. Nowell.

1769. **Beveridge** (Will., *D.D.*) Sermons. 12 vols. 12mo.

The author was Bp. of St. Asaph and one of the brighest ornaments of the Church in his times. In his "Private thoughts upon Religion," some will be found on grace and election. The 1st ed. of his serms. (150) was *Lond.*, 1708, in 12 vols, 8vo.

——— **Allen** (John) Serm., 1 Cor. ix., 27. The Enthusiast's notion of Election to Eternal Life disproved. 8vo. *Oxf.*

——— **Farington** (Will.) Sermons. 8vo. *Warrington.*

P. 3. Man an accountable creature; p. 101, Reliance on Providence; p. 151, Redemption. The author was Rector of Warrington, and Vicar of Leigh.

——— **Leland** (John, *D.D.*) Discourses. 4 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*

Vol 2. The proofs of a Divine Providence and several Serms. on God's providential government, with answers to objections. The author was a native of Wigan, pastor of a congregation of Presbyterian dissenters in Dublin and he acquired reputation by his treatise in defence of Christianity.

——— **Smith** (Haddon, *D.D.*) Sermons. 8vo.

One on the Necessity of Divine Grace, and another on the governing providence of God. 2nd ed., *Rochester*, 1809, 8vo. The author was Reader of the Temple, and Lecturer of St. Margaret's, Westminster.

——— **Scholliner** (Herm.) Prælectiones theologicæ. 12 vols. *Aug. Vind.*

Vol vi. De Deo auctore Gratiæ actualis. "Vir erat præclari ingenii, vastæ eruditionis, felicissimæ memoriæ, etc."—*Hurter.*

1770. **Dana** (James) An examination of Edwards on the Freedom of the Will. 8vo. *Boston* [*U.S.*]

Another ed., 1773, 8vo.

——— **Wesley** (John) The Question,—What is an Arminian? answered by a lover of Free Grace. 12mo. pp. 8. *Brist.*

Same year, *Lond.*, 8vo; another ed., *Lond.*, 1798, 12mo.

Not in the Brit. Mus.

———**Biagi** (Clemente) Dissertatio adversus novum systema I. L. Blanchii de remedio æternæ salutis pro parvulis in utero clausis sine baptismate morientibus. 4to *Faventiæ.*

——— **Toplady** (Aug. Mont.) A Letter to the Rev. Mr. John Wesley relative to his abridgment of Zanchius on Predestination. 8vo. *Lond.*

2nd ed. 1771.

——— **Sellon** (Walter) Defence of God's Sovereignty against the impious and horrible aspersions cast upon it by Elisha Coles. 12mo

Another ed., *Lond.*, 1814, 8vo, pp. 350. The author also wrote on "The Doctrine of Redemption," 12mo, see his Works, 1814, 2 vols, 8vo. He was curate of Breedon.

1770. **Milton** (John) The state of Innocence and Fall of Man described in Paradise Lost, rendered into prose with notes from the French of Raymond de St. Maur. 8vo. *Aberdeen.*

——— **Ashton** (Thos., *D.D.*) Sermons. 8vo. *Lond.*

Ps. 65-7. God's providence displayed in the suppresssion of popular tumults.

——— **Cennick** (John) Discourses. 2 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*

Vol 1. The Fall and Redemption.
,, 2. The assurance of faith.

The former had been issued separately, *Dublin*, 175—, and *Lond.*, 1756, 12mo; and the latter *Lond.*, 1756, 12mo, and a 3rd ed., *Lond.*, 1786, 8vo.

——— **Kilber** (Henry) Theologico-dogmatico-polemico-scholastica prælectionibus academicis accommodata. Tract III. De peccatis, gratia, justificatione et merito. pp. 736. 8vo. *Wirceb.*

A Jesuit.

——— **Kreussler** (Ignatius) Character Jansenisticæ factionis in doctrina et moribus breviter adumbratus. 4to. pp. 38. *Bambergæ.*

The author was teacher of philosophy at Heidelberg, and of Theology in Bamberg. He was a Jesuit, and d. 1780.

——— **Tollner** (J. Gli.) Disquis. utrum deus ex mero arbitrio potestaten suam legislatoriam exerceat, an vero ita, ut hum. ratio etiam legum divinarum perfectionem perspiciat? 4to. *Lug. Bat.*

——— **Linek** (Matt., *S.J.*) Commentationes de Gratia Divina. 4to. *Pragæ, Veteris.*

——— **Fellowes** (John) Grace Triumphant. A poem. 8vo. *Birmingham.*

——— Preservation against Fate.

——— **Gazzaniga** (P. M.) Prælectiones Theol. 3 vols. pp. 891, 628, 644. 8vo. *Vindobonæ.*

Vol 1, p. 456, De Scientia Dei; p. 591, De Dei Voluntate; p. 768, De Providentia; p. 795, De Prædestinatione; p. 872, De Reprobatione. Vol 2, p. 389, De Actibus humanis. Vol 3, De Gratia Christi. This work is rare and contains much of value.

1771. **Blakes** (James) The Grace of our L. J. C. recommended in a sermon taken down by. 4to.

——— **Tamburini** (Pierre) Sur l'excellence et la Nécessité même de la doctrine Catholique touchant la grace de J. C. 12mo. *Brescia.*

In Latin, *Ticini*, 1786, 8vo.

——— **Remegius** (Sti., *Archiep. Lugd.*) De Gratia et Predestinatione, a P. F. Fogginio. 12mo. *Romæ.*

——— **Roberts** (W. H., *D.D.*) A Poetical Essay on the Providence of God. 4to. *Lond.*

1771. **Boston** (Thos.) View of the Covenant of Grace from the Sacred Records. 12mo

The 1st ed. seems to have been, *Edin.*, 1742, 8vo; & there were numerous other ed., *Edinb.*, 1747, 8vo; *Glasgow*, 1767, 12mo; and 1770, 12mo; *Paisley*, 1771, 12mo; 1775, 8vo; 1790, 12mo; 1796, 8vo; etc. The above book appears in his Works, *Edin.*, 1767, fol. In his complete Works in 12 vols, *Lond.*, 1852, 8vo, will be found:—vol 1, p. 149, The Decrees of God; p. 186, The Providence of God; p. 242, The fall of our first parents; p. 273, Our fall in Adam; p. 301, Election to everlasting life; p. 557, Effectual calling. Vol 8 deals with human nature in its fourfold state, which was also published separately, *Berwick*, 1784, 8vo. Boston published separately a sermon on the "Method of Recovery from the Ruins of the Fall," without date, and was also author of a sermon on "The Sovereignty and wisdom of God displayed in the afflictions of men, etc." [Edited by Alex. Cobden] 1737, 8vo.

He was a minister of the gospel at Ettrick, and d. 1732.

——— **Law** (Edmund) Sermon. The grounds of a particnlar Providence. 4to. *Lond.*

The author was Bp. of Carlisle and translator of King on the Origin of Evil. He d. 1787. In his considerations on the theory of religion, *Lond.*, 1784, 8vo; 7th ed. and a new ed. of which appeared *Lond.*, 1820, p. 43, he has a treatise on the "Plan of Providence with regard to the time and manner of the several dispensations of revealed religion," which is able but dangerous.

——— **Riccaltoun** (Rob.) Works never before printed. 3 vols. 8vo. *Edinb.*

Vol 1. Essays on human nature.
Vol 2. Man's original state and fall.

——— **Reuss** (I. Fr.) Dissertatio qua systema doctrinæ reformatorum de Prædestinatione et gratia revocatur. 4to. *Tub.*

——— An answer to an appeal to the serious and candid Professors of Christianity. pp. 36. 8vo. *Leeds.*

2nd ed., *Lond.*, 8vo, pp. 72.

On the subject of the power of Man to do the Will of God, Original Sin, Election and Reprobation, etc.

——— **Backus** (Issac) The doctrine of Sovereign grace opened and vindicated. 8vo. *Providence, Rhode Island.*

The author was a Baptist minister of Massachusetts. Died 1806.

——— **Bergier** (Nicolas Sylvestre) Examen du Matérialisme. 2 tom. 12mo. *Paris.*

——— **Nowell** (T., *D.D.*) The Church of England vindicated from the charge of Absolute Predestination. 8vo.

1772. **Bossuet** (J. B.) Sermons. 17 vols. 12mo. *Par.*

Vol 5, p. 1. Sur la providence.

——— **Knox** (Hugh) A letter to the Rev. Mr. J. Green, of New Jersey, pointing out some difficulties in the Calvinistic scheme of divinity respecting Free-will, Divine Decrees, Particular Redemption, etc. 12mo. *Lond.*

1772. **Brooke** (Henry) Redemption, a poem. 4to. *Lond.*
Another ed., 1821, 12mo.

——— **Stafford** (John) The Scripture doctrine of sin and grace. 8vo. *Lond.*
Another ed. 1774, pp. 501, 8vo.
"Experimental."—*Bickersteth.* "Enters very minutely into the Christian's experience of sin and grace."—*Williams.*
The author was an Independent minister.

——— **Bate** (James) A Summary view and defence of the scheme of redemption in a parochial letter.
Pp. iv, 58. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Berrow** (Capel) Theological Dissertations. 4to. *Lond.*
On predestination, election, and reprobation.

——— Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum.
See 1765.
Vol. 8, p. 481. Prudentii Clementis opera omnia—liber de origine peccatorum.

——— **Thorold** (Sir John) Extracts of letters rolating to Methodists and Moravians. To which are added, a view of part of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans: and a vindication of the 17th Article of Religion. 3rd ed. pp. iv, 62.
8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Tucker** (Josiah, *D.D.*) Six Sermons on important subjects.
12mo. *Bristol.*
One on Rom. 9, 21. God considered as both a potter over the clay, and as a judge over moral and rational agents.
The author was Preb. of Bristol, 1756, and Dean of Gloucester, 1758, and d. 1799.

——— **Toplady** (A. M.) More Work for Mr. John Wesley, or a vindication of the Decrees and Providence of God from the defamations of a late printed paper, entitled "The consequence proved."

——— **West** (Stephen, *D.D.*) Essay on Moral Agency. 12mo. *N. Haven.*
This work contains remarks on Edwards's Enquiry on the Freedom of the Will, with appendix, *Salem* [*Mass.*] 1794, 8vo. The author was a minister at Stockbridge, Mass. [U. S.] 1759—1818, d. 1819.
The ed. of 1794, is the only ed. which is in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Fletcher** (J. W.) Logica Genovensis. 12mo. *Bristol.*

——— [**Hill** (Sir R.)] A Review of all the doctrines taught by the Rev. Mr. J. Wesley. 2nd ed. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— Real Scriptural Predestination asserted. 8vo.

1773. **Winchester** (Thomas) A Dissertation on the XVII. Article of the Ch. of England, &c. 8vo.
Another ed., 1808, 8vo, in The Churchman's Remembrancer, 2 vols in 1, *Lond.*, 1807, 8vo.

——— **Palafox.** Janseniana Erroris calumnia. 4to. *Mantuæ.*

1773. [**Priestley** (Joseph, *LL.D.*)] An Address to the serious and candid professors of Christianity on Election and Reprobation. *Lond.*
The celebrated Unitarian. d. 1804.
See 1777

——— **Fletcher** (John W.) An Appeal to Matter-of-Fact and Common Sense; or, a Rational Demonstration of Man's Corrupt and Lost Estate. 12mo. *Brist.*
The author was the well-known pious Rector of of Madeley. His views were Arminian, but he endeavoured to unite them with the Calvinists.
He d. 1785.

——— [**Stonehouse** (Sir Geo.)] Universal Restitution Vindicated against the Calvinists, in Five Dialogues.
pp. 176, 8vo. *Brist.*

——— **Francis** (John, *LL.D.*) Sermons.
2 vols, 12mo. *Lond.*
Vol 1, p. 13, the protection of Providence a nation's only security.
The author was Rector of Morley, Suffolk.

——— **Phipps** (Joseph) The Original and Present State of Man briefly considered. pp. ii., 220, 8vo. *Lond.*
The author was a Quaker.

——— **Cowper** (The Hon. and Rev. Spencer, *D.D.*) 8 Discourses.
8vo. *Lond.*
Predestination.
The author was son of Lord Chancellor Cowper, and was educated at Exeter Coll., Oxford. He became Rector of Fordwich, Prebendary of Canterbury and Dean of Durham.

——— **Neuff** (Francis Ant.) Theses de Christo redemptore, et redemptoris gratia. 4to. *Bambergæ.*
The author, a Jesuit, was Prof. of Theology in the Univ. of Bamberg, and d. 1779.

——— **Perronet** (Chas.) Archopties; or the Antinomian Creed, etc.
pp. 4. 12mo.
A Wesleyan, also author of "Divine Providence exemplified in a singular deliverance at Sea," *Rochester*, 1773, pp. 24.

——— **Smith** (Robert) An Attempt to Vindicate and Illustrate the divine doctrine of Original Sin.
8vo. *Glasgow.*
The author was minister of the gospel at Ridge near Auchinleck.

——— **Edwards** (Jonathan) The Justice of God in the damnation of sinners, a serm. 8vo. *Boston* [*U.S.*]
Other ed, *Boston*; printed and reprinted, *Lond.*, 1774, 8vo; 1788, 8vo: *Newark* [*N.J.*], 1814, 12mo.

1774. **Regenboog** (Jac.) Historie der Remonstranten. 2 vols. *Amst.*
Another ed., *Lemgo*, 1781, 8vo.

——— **Toplady** (Aug. Mont.) Historic Proof of the Doctrinal Calvinism of the Church of England.
2 vols, pp. 787, 8vo. *Lond.*
Reprinted in 1793, and also in his collected works, "This work," says the Presbyt. Rev. for 1837, "is a full and unanswerable demonstration

that from the earliest days of her history the Ch. of England has never held any other doctrine." Toplady seems to also have written "A Check to Pelagianism." The "Historic Proof" is the best historical work in favour of Calvinism in the English language. The author, unfortunately, attributes to Arminians views which they equally with himself would reject. It is a matter for regret that a little of the time devoted to the acquiring knowledge of the views of others agreeing with the controversialist, were not devoted to a dispassionate investigation of the views intended to be refuted.

1774. **Toplady** (Aug. Mont.) Freewill and Merit examined, or men not their own Saviours, on Ps., c.xv, 1.

——— **Natali** (Mart. Episc. Clug.) Completiones Augustinianæ de gratia Dei. 2 vols, 8vo. *Ticini.*

——— **Hunter** (Thos.) Moral Discourses on Providence and other important subjects. 2 vols, 8vo. *Warrington.*

The author was Vicar of Weavenham, Cheshire, and d. 1777.

"Superior to the ordinary class."—*Critical Rev.*

——— **Rowland** (Daniel) Eight Sermons. 12mo. *Lond.*

p. 47, Free Grace indeed!

The author was an eminent Welsh preacher.

——— **Woty** (Will.) Particular Providence, a Poetical Essay. 4to. *Lond.*

——— Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum.

See 1765.

Vol 10, p. 357, Prædestinatus sive prædestinatorum heresis, et Sirmondi historia prædestinatiana.

——— **Mac Mahon** (Thos. O'Brien) An Essay on the depravity and corruption of human nature. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Phipps** (Joseph) A reply to a late publication of Newton, intituled, An Appendix, etc., in answer to which it is plainly shewn that the Quakers are not Calvinists. pp. 43, 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Wesley** (John) Thoughts upon Necessity. pp. 33, 12mo. *Lond.*

2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1775; dated at Glasgow, May 14th, 1774.

The 2nd ed. only in Brit. Mus.

——— **Turretinus** (Jo. Alph.) Opera Omnia theologica, philosophica, et philologica. 3 vols, 4to. *Leov. et Franc.*

Vol. 1, De Providentia Dei—De libertate humana contra Spinosam.

——— **Atkinson** (Christopher) Sermons.

One on God's superintending providence and another on God the author of all special graces.

3rd ed., *Lond.*, 1782, 8vo.

1775. **Toplady** (Aug. Mont.) The Scheme of Christian and Philosophical Necessity asserted in opposition to Mr. John Wesley's tract on that subject. pp. 159, 8vo. *Lond.*

In vol 6 of his collected works, see 1769.

An interesting and quaint tract in favour of the supralapsarian scheme. Mr. Wesley suffers severely in his peculiar handling.

1775. Theses Theolog. de gratia Christi sec. doctrinam Augustini et Thomæ. 8vo. *Mexici.*

——— **Horne** (Geo., *D.D.*) The Providence of God manifested in the Rise and Fall of Empires. A Serm. 8vo. *Lond.*

The author was an eminent divine of the Hutchinsonian school, Fell. of Magdalen Coll., 1749, and Pres., 1768; Chaplain to the King, 1771; Vice-Chancellor of the Univ. of Oxford, 1776; Dean of Canterbury, 1781, and Bp. of Norwich, 1790. He d. 1792, and is best remembered for his celebrated work on the Psalms.

——— **Marchisius** (M. A.) De divina voluntate, de Prædestinatione, et gratia prælectiones theologicæ. 8vo. *Taurini.*

——— **Tollner's** Abtrandl. bes: comm. de potestate Dei legislatoria non mere arbitraria. 8vo. *Frankf.*

——— **Whitehead** (John, *M.D.*) Essay on Liberty and Necessity. pp. 123, 12mo. *Lond.*

In this Essay Wesley's "Thoughts on Necessity" are examined and defended.

The work is not in the Brit. Mus.

1776. **Johnson** (John) The Nature of Gospel Grace, opened in 12 Discourses on interesting subjects of the N. T. 2 vols, 8vo. *Warrington.*

——— **Willets** (W.) Sketches of the Œconomy of Divine Providence with respect to Religion among Mankind. 8vo. *Lond.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Bourdaloue** (Louis) Practical Divinity, translated from the French by A. C. 4 vols, 12mo. *Lood.*

Vol 3, p. 93. Divine grace.

——— **Bruning** (Ant.) MS. Tractatus de Gratia de Deo, de Trinitate.

See De Backer, iv., 72.

The author was a Jesuit and Prof. of Philosophy and Theology, who died at Liege in 1776.

——— **Seiler** (G. F.) Pr. justificationis a prædestinat. discrepantiam probat. 4to. *Ebend.*

——— **Wesley** (John) Some Observations on Liberty, occasioned by a late tract. pp. 36, 12mo. *Lond.*

——— **Stattler** (Benedict) Theologia Christiana Theoretica. 8vo. *Ingolst.*

Tract iii.—De hominis creatione et diverso statu ante et post lapsum in peccatum; Tract IV.—De Gratia Dei.

The author was a Jesuit, who d. 1797.

——— **Witherspoon** (John, *D.D.*) The Dominion of Providence over the passions of men. A Sermon. 8vo. *Philadelphia.*

2nd ed., *Philadelp.* printed, *Glasgow* reprinted, 1777, 8vo; another, *Lond.*, 1778, 8vo.

1777. **Wesley** (John) Thoughts upon God's Sovereignty.
pp. 11. 12mo. *Lond.*
Three eds. appear to have been published in this year.

——— **Priestley** (Jos.) The Doctrine of Philosophical Necessity. 8vo. *Lond.*
Priestley defended this work by two letters to John Palmer, 1779--80, both 8vo, and the letter to Jacob Bryant, 1780, 8vo.
Priestley was a rank Determinist, and consistently with his principles, controverted as Hartley had done, the doctrine of free agency, and endeavoured to establish a system of materialism. He criticised at the same time both Hume and his antagonists. He d. 1804.

——— **Hall** (A.) Redemption by Christ without Law. 8vo

——— **Le Clerc de Beauberon** (Nic. Franc.) Tractatus theologico-dogmaticus de Homine lapso et reparato.
2 vols. 8vo. *Luxemburgi.*
Another ed., *Par*, 1779, 8vo.

——— **Klemer** (Joseph) De peccatis et auxiliis gratiæ. 4to. *Heildeb.*
The author, a Jesuit, was professor of Theology in the University of Heidelberg, and died in 1786.

——— **Seiler** (G. F.) Pr. Vere in Christum credentes omnes justificari non ad vitam æternam prædestinatos solum.
4to. *Ebend.*

——— ——— üb den Untersch. der Reehtfert, u. Prädestinat.; einige abhandl. im Namen u. mit Beistisum. der theol. Facultat zu Erlangen aufgesetzt; nebst einer Beautw. der von Danov. diesen abhandl. entgegengesetzten Schrift.
8vo. *Erl.*

——— **Smyth**. Fall and Recovery of Man. A poem.
pp. 72. 12mo. *Belfast.*

——— **Sturm** (C. C.) Considérations sur les œuvres de Dieu dans le rêgne de la nature et de la providence, trad. de l'allemand par M. Constance. *La Haye.*
Many other eds., same place, 1780, 3 vols, 8vo; *Genev.*, 1788, 3 vols, 12mo.
In English, many ed., *Edinb.*, 1788, 3 vols, 12mo; *Lond.*, 1791, 3 vols, 12mo; 1795, 3 vols, 12mo; 1798, 3 vols, 12mo; 1798, 3 vols, 8vo; *Edinb.*, 1800, 3 vols, 12mo; *Lond.*, [1800 ?] 2 vols, 8vo; *Edin.*, 1802, 3 vols, 12mo; *Bungay*, 1804, 2 vols, 8vo; 1807, 2 vols, 8vo; *Lond.*, 1808, 2 vols, 12mo; 1810, 3 vols, 12mo; *Faversham*, 1813, 2 vols, 8vo; *Plymouth*, 1816, 3 vols, 12mo; *Lond.*, 1817, 2 vols, 12mo; *Lond.*, 1818, 2 vols, 8vo; 1824, 4 vols, 12mo; *Lond.*, 1850, 12mo. In French, *La Haye*, 1786, 3 vols, 8vo; *Londres*, 1798, 2 vols, 12mo.

——— **Carr** (Geo.) Sermons.
3 vols. 12mo. *Edinb.*
1st ed. not in B. M. 2nd ed., *Edinb.*, 1778, 8vo. 5ih and best ed., *Edinb.*, 1784, 2 vols, 8vo, vol. 2, p. 86. Goodness of God in the redemption, and p. 183, On Divine Grace, and human operation; 8th ed., *Edin.*, 1796, 8vo. The author was educated at St. John's Coll., Camb., & held the post of senior clergyman of the Episcopal Chapel, Edinb., where he officiated 39 years.

1777. **Brookes** (Thos.) A Treatise on Assurance. 12mo. *Edinb.*
Had appeared, *Lond*, 1654, 8vo, under the title "Heaven on Earth," 2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1657, 8vo. Another ed., *Lond.*, 1810, 12mo.

1778. **[Caulfield]**. An Essay on the Immateriality and Immortality of the Soul, and its instinctive sense of Good and Evil.....with an appendix in answer to Dr. Priestley's Disquisitions on Matter and Spirit. By the author of the Letters in proof of a Particular Providence, addressed to Dr. Hawkesworth. p.p. iv. 466. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Horsley** (Sam., *LL.D.*) Providence and Free Agency. A serm. 4to. *Lond.*
The author was Rector of Newington Butts, 1759; of Albury, Surrey, 1774; Preb. of St. Paul's, 1778; Archdeacon of St. Albans, 1780; Bishop of St. David's, 1788; and of Rochester, 1793; and of St. Asaph, 1802. d. 1806; see *Allibone*, vol 1, 895.

——— **Priestley** (Jos., *LL.D.*) A Free Discussion of the doctrines of materialism and philosophical necessity.
8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Whitehead** (John) Answer to Priestley's Disquisition. 8vo.
Priestley's work was also replied to by "Reflexions on Materialism addressed to Dr. Priestley by Philalethes Rusticans," 8vo; "Observations on Dr. Priestley's Doctrine, etc.," 1788, 12mo. See too Edward Holme's attempt to prove the materiality of the soul, 1787, 8vo, and "A sketch of the controversy between Dr. Priestley and his opponents,' by Rev. Samuel Badcock, 8vo.

——— **Hegelmaier** (T. B.) Diss. de peccato orig. 4to. *Tub.*

——— **Wesley** (John) The Arminian Magazine, consisting of extracts and original Treatises on Universal Redemption.

——— **Helton** (John) The deplorable state of man and his redemption by J. C., extracts from a late author.
pp. 66. 8vo.
The author was a Wesleyan.

——— **Manners** (Nicholas) Strictures on Omicron's Ninth Letter, the subject of which is Election and Perseverance. pp. 56. 12mo. *Warrington.*
The author was a Wesleyan, and wrote also some discourses on Man's original state, the Fall of Adam, Election and final Perseverance, which is a reprint of the above Strictures. 3rd edition, *York*, 1780, pp. 308, 12mo.

[1778]. **Atkinson**. The doctrine of free grace—asserted and vindicated.
8vo. *Leeds.*

1779. **Mendham** (Tho.) Serious and free thought on the doctrine of Election, Reprobation, Freewill, and the Fall of Man and his restoration through Christ Jesus. 12mo. *Norw.*

1779. **Fisher** (Joseph) Review of Dr. Priestley's Doctrine of Philosophical Necessity. 12mo.

——— **Priestley** (Jos.) A Letter to Mr. J. Palmer in defence of the Illustrations of Philosophical Necessity. 8vo. *Lond.*

To this Mr. Palmer wrote a reply entitled "An Appendix to the Observations, etc.," *Lond.*, 1780, 8vo, pp. 36.

——— **Palmer** (John) Observations in defence of the Liberty of Man as a Moral Agent; in answer to Dr. Priestley's Illustration of Philosophical Necessity. 8vo. pp. 244. *Lond.*

An Appendix, 1780, 8vo.

The author was a Presbyterian Minister of New Broad street, London, originally a Calvinist, and subsequently a Socinian, see life of Toulmin in Monthly Mag., 1797. The above is a valuable tract, but rarely to be met with. Mr. Palmer published an appendix as noted above, *Lond.*, 1780, 8vo.

——— Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum.

See 1765.

Vol 13, p. 553. Amulonis Ludgunensis epistolæ, et opuscula duo de prescientia et prædestinatione. —see 1640, 1765.

——— **Dekar** (H.) Serm., Rom. ix, 21, Scriptural Predestination and election displayed. 2nd ed. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Seiler** (G. F.) Von der Erbsünde od. dem matürl. Verderben des Menschen. 8vo. *Erl.*

——— **Price** (Rh., *D.D.*, *LL.D.*) A free discussion of the doctrine of Materialism and Necessity, in a correspondence between Dr. Price and Dr. Priestley.

See Gent. Mag., 1791, Apl., 389.

[1780] **Pejacevich** (Francis Xavier) Tractatus de Gratia et merito. *Græcii.*

"Ab eruditissimo Bandelio in suo opusculo multum landatus."—*Stoger.* The author was a Jesuit Rector of Agram, Fimi-Kirchen and Possega, and died in 1780, see De Bacher, vi, 429—30.

1780. **Priestley** (Joseph) A Letter to Jacob Bryant, Esq., in defence of Philosophical Necessity. pp. 64. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— ——— A second letter to the Rev. John Palmer in defence of the doctrine of Philosophical Necessity. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Sander** (H.) Ueber die Vorsehung. 4to. *Leipz.*

Another ed., *Aug.*, 1801.

——— **Bryant** (Jacob) Address to Dr. Priestley, upon his doctrine of Philosophical Necessity illustrated. pp. 136. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **De Cœtlogon** (Charles Edward) The Scripture Doctrine of Grace. A serm. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Macgowan** (John) The Foundry Budget opened.

This is a reply to W. Sellon's "Defence of God's sovereignty from the aspersions cast upon it by E. Coles.

The author was a minister of the Particular Baptists.

1780. **Macgowan** (J.) Discourse on the Book of Ruth, and other important subjects wherein the wonders of Providence, the Riches of Grace, are faithfully exemplified and improved. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Dawes** (Matthew) Philosophical Considerations, or enquiry into the merits of the controversy between Drs. Priestley and Price, on Matter and Spirit, and Philosophical Necessity. 8vo. *Lond.*

1781. **D[awson]** (B[enjamin]) The Doctrine of philosophical Necessity briefly invalidated. 12mo. *Kendal.*

The author was Rector of Burgh, Suffolk. 2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1803, 12mo, assigned to John Dawson of Sedbergh, in the Brit. Mus. Cat.

——— **[Gourlin** (Abbe P. E.)] Tract. de Gratia Christi Salvatoris ac de Prædestinatione Sanctorum. 3 vols. 4to. *Sine loco.*

A most valuable work.

[1781.] De Monnoniete Voorvegter voorden Hertog van Brunswyk Wolffenbuttel; bestaande in een Koffyhius-Gesprek tusschen een Gereformeerde, Lutheriaan, Remonstrant, *etc.* 8vo. [*Amst.*]

1781. **Hall** (Rob.) Help to Zion's travellers. 18mo. *Bristol.*

2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1807, 18mo.

"It well deserves the title."—*Bickersteth.* The author was a Baptist Minister at Arnsby, Leicestershire, father of the well known Robert Hall.

——— **Neve** (Tim., *D.D.*) Jesus the Saviour of the World, and the Redeemer of Mankind. 8vo. *Oxf.*

The author was Margaret Prof. of Divinity at Oxf.; and Preb. of Worcester, 1783.

——— **Brouwer** (P. W., *Resp.* Dissertat Theol. de corruptione nativa, *Præs.* C Boers. 4to. *Lug. Bat*

——— **Eifert** (K. Trg.) Könnte nicht die mos Erzähl. vom Sündenfalle buchstabl. wahr etc sein? 8vo. *Halæ.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Armand** (Jacques) Sermon sur la providence. 8vo. *Paris.*

——— **Castillon** (Frédéric de) Recherches sur une Providence Particulière. In French and Dutch. 4to.

[1781.] **Cowper** (Will.) Human confidence reproved, deference to Divine Providence recommended. A Serm. 8vo. *Durham.*

The author was Curate at Seaham.

1782. **Friderick** (B.) Dissertat. Theol. de Providentia Divina. 4to. *Lug. Bat*

1782. **Viator a Cocaleo.** Tentaminum scholasticorum synopsis.
2 vols. 4to. *Venet.*
De providentia.

——— **Balfour** (James) Of Liberty and Necessity. 8vo. *Edin.*
In Philosophical Dissertations. The author was Vicar of Pilrig.

——— **Rotheram** (John) An Essay on Human Liberty. 8vo. *Newcastle.*

——— [**Priestley** (Joseph)] On matter and spirit and philosophical necessity.
2 vols. 8vo. *Birm.*

——— Some Remarks on a pamphlet entitled, "A Third Check to Antinomianism," etc. 8vo.

——— **Eckley** (Jos.) Divine glory brought to view in the condemnation of the ungodly. 8vo. *Boston* (*U.S.*)

1783. **Sartorius** (Carl. Jos. Cas. Leon. Aloys) Specimen Historiæ Opinionum de Sorte Infantium sine Baptismate mortuorum. 8vo. pp. 50. *Wirceburgi.*

——— **Dawson** (Benj., *LL.D.*) The Necessarian, or Questions concerning Liberty and Necessity stated.
pp. 103. 8vo. *Lond.*
This work is now rare. The author was Rector of Burgh, Suffolk, and died 1814, aged 85. He was also the author of a work entitled "The doctrine of Philosophical Necessity briefly invalidated" which suggested to Dr. Copleston his Enquiry, 1811, or at least the first of his Discourses. This statement is gathered from connecting the above entry with the introductory remarks of Dr. Copleston to the Preface to his Enquiry, and being only a matter of inference may not be correct. The main fact assumed is that "Benj. Dawson" is "Mr. Dawson of Sedbergh." See entry on last page, 1781.

——— **Craven** (Will.) Sermons on the Evidence of a future state of rewards and punishments arising from a view of our nature and condition. 8vo. *Camb.*
A Serm. on the moral nature with which man is endued. Another ed., *Camb.*, 1785, 8vo. "The subject is treated with great perspicuity, and Mr. Hume's objections solidly refuted."—*Bp. Watson.* The author was Prof. of Arabic in the Univ. of Camb.

[1783.] **Allen** (Timothy) Salvation for all men, put out of all dispute.
8vo. *Hartford* [*Conn.*]

1784. [**Camil**] Salvation of all Men; the grand thing aimed at in the Scheme of God, as opened in the New Testament. 8vo.

——— **Fagaras** (Jos. P. de) Diss. qua demonstratur, non esse contra naturam Dei perfectiss., effecisse mundum, in quo mala insunt. 8vo. *Lug. Bat.*

——— **Wesley** (John) The Doctrine of Original Sin—Extracted from a late author. 12mo. pp. 40.
Reprinted from Wesley's Treatise (vol ix, p. 434, etc.), and taken originally from Boston's "Fourfold State," Osborn's Wesl. Bibliog.

1784. **Breck** (Robert) Past dispensations of Providence called to mind in a Serm.
12mo. *Hartford* (*Conn.*)

——— **Ecking** (Samuel) Three Essays on Grace, Faith, and Experience. 8vo.
This 1st ed. not in Brit. Mus. 2nd ed., *Liverp.*, 1799, pp. xv., 214, 12mo. 3rd ed., *Liverp.*, 1806, 12mo.

——— **Frœlich** (Wolfg.) De Libertate Animæ Humanæ Prælectiones Theologicæ et Philosophicæ.
pp. 178. *Anglipoli.*
The author was Prof. of Theology in the Catholic University at Anglipolitana.

1785. **Chauncy** (Charles, *D.D.*) Five dissertations on the Scripture Account of the Fall and its consequences.
8vo. *Lond.*
The author was a native and minister of Boston (U.S.) He was eminent for his learning, and marked for his spirit of independence.

——— **Worthington** (Hugh) Discourses.
8vo. *Lond.*
p. 1, A Vindication of Divine Providence.
p. 122, On the state of human nature (2 disc.)
p. 169, God's impartiality in his dealings with men.
p. 275, Our calling and election made sure.
The author was a dissenting minister at Leeds.

——— **Muzzarelli** (Alphonse) Il buon uso della Logica in materia di Religione.
8vo. 4 vols. *Ferarra.*
A Diss. on original sin. Several editions, *Fuligno*, 1787, 8vo, 3 vols; *Rome*, 1807, 12mo, 10 vols; *Firenzi*, 1821, 12mo, 11 vols. The author was a Jesuit, and celebrated theologian, who died in 1813.

——— **Davy** (Will.) A System of Divinity, Serms. on the Being, Nature, and Attributes of God.
6 vols. 12mo. *Exeter.*
Another ed., *Lustleigh*, 1795—1807, 26 vols, 8vo. This is printed by the author himself. 14 copies only. Another ed., *Exeter*, 1825, 2 vols, 8vo; 1827, 3 vols, 8vo.

1786. **Gib** (Adam) Sacred Contemplations on the Covenant of Works, the Covenant of Grace, and on Liberty and Necessity. 8vo. *Edinb.*
The author was a native of Perthshire, and one of the founders of the Secession Church in Scotland.

——— **Evans** (David) General Election, or Salvation for all men illustrated and proved. 8vo. pp. 271. *S.L.*

——— **Petitpierre** (Ferdinand Olivier) Le Plan de Dieu envers les hommes tel qu'il l'a manifesté dans la nature et dans la grace. 8vo. *Hamb.*

——— **Pignone** (Em. N.) Augustinus sui interpres in explicanda gratia creaturæ innocentis necessaria ad bene agendum dissertatio. 8vo. *Neap.*

1786. **Miln** (R.) A Course of Physico-Theological Lectures on the State of the World from the Creation to the Deluge. 8vo. *Carlisle.*

The author treats of the Creation, Man in Paradise; The Fall, Consequences of the Fall, &c,

——— **Palmer** (Samuel) The Calvinism of the Protestant Dissenters asserted. 8vo.

The author was an Independent minister at the Weigh House, London, 1763; removed to Hackney, 1767.

——— **Deane.** The Glory of God considered in reference to Man's fall and recovery. 8vo. *Bristol.*

1787. **Franck** (Augustus Herman) The footsteps of Providence; or the bountiful hand of heaven defraying the expenses of faith. 8vo. *Lond.*

The author was a Pietist, and d. 1727. Another ed., 1788.

——— **Cuenin.** Tractatus de peccatis, de gratia et de merito, de vera religione, de Deo uno et trino. 3 vols. 4to.

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Greve** (P.) Die Grösse und Herrlichk. Gottes in seiner Vorsehung n. Regierung überhaupt u. der Kirche Christi insbesondere. 8vo. *Fleusb. u Leipzig.*

——— **Purves** (James) Observations on Dr. Priestley's Doctrines of Philosophical Necessity and Materialism. 12mo. *Philad.*

Another ed., *Philad.*, 1797, 12mo, pp. 244.

——— **[A]** (S.) Christ the Sinner's ransom; or the efficacy of divine grace displayed. A Poem. 8vo. *Lond.*

1788. De Ratione et Auctoritate præcipue S. Augustini in rebus Theologicis, ac speciatim in tradento mysterio Prædestinationis et Gratiæ Dissertatio. 8vo. *Ticini.*

[1788.] **Benson** (Jos.) Remarks on Dr. Priestley's System of Materialism, Mechanism, & Necessity. 12mo. *Hull.*

The author was a Wesleyan minister, and he published a continuation of these remarks the same year.

1788. **Holwell** (John Zephaniah) Dissertations on the Origin, Nature, and Pursuits of Intelligent Beings, and on the Divine Providence, Religion, &c. 8vo. *Lond.*

The author was one of the sufferers in the "Black Hole" of Calcutta. The above is a curious and interesting work.

——— **Shepherd** (Rich., *D.D.*) The ground and credibility of the Christian religion. 8vo. *Lond.*

p. 55, Divine superintendence and particular providence. The author was Archdeacon of Bedford.

——— **Stebbing** (Henry, jun., *D.D.*) Sermons. 8vo.

Vol 2, p. 233, The permission of evil (2 Serm.)

1788. **Regono** (Ant. Jos.) Libertatis humanæ theoria. 8vo. *Vercellis.*

——— **Reeve** (Joseph) Practical Discourses on the Perfections and wonderful works of God. 12mo. *Exeter.*

The Providence of God, his mercy and justice. 2nd ed., *Exet.*, 1793, 12mo, 2 vols. New ed., 1840, 2 vols, 12mo; also *Balt.* (*U.S.*) 8vo. The author was a Jesuit, and wrote also a History of Jansenism which was never printed. The MS. has probably been lost. Oliver says, "I have heard Reeve say, that he had prepared a considerable work on the history of Jansenism, that he had lent it to the Rev. Charles Needham, the chaplain of Tor Abbey, for revision; but never recovered it from his hands."—*De Backer*, v, 605.

——— **Rowles** (Sam.) A Defence of the Harmony of Satisfaction and Free Grace in the Salvation of Sinners. 12mo. *Lond.*

The author was a Dissenting Divine.

——— **Isaac** (John) Gospel Doctrine of Free Grace. 12mo.

——— **Petitpierre** (F. O.) Thoughts on the Divine Goodness relative to the government of Moral Agents. From the French. *Bath.*

——— **Agnostos.** The Reality and Efficacy of Divine Grace. 8vo. *Lond.*

A reply to Philanthropos (*pseud. i.e.* D. Taylor.)

——— **Coetlogon** (C. E. de) The Year of Christ in Redemption, a Serm. 8vo.

Not in the Brit. Mus.

Author also of The Grace of Christ in Redemption, *Lond.*, 1794, 8vo.

——— **Huntington** (Will.) Arminian Skeleton; or, the Arminians dissected and anatomised. *Lond.*

The popular Calvinist Methodist preacher. He wrote S.S. after his name, which he thus explains, "As I cannot get a D.D., for want of cash, neither can I get an M.A., for want of learning: therefore I am compelled to fly for refuge to S.S., by which I mean 'sinner saved.'" He was originally a labourer.

1788—98. **Ludlam** (T.) Essays on Theological and Moral Subjects. 8vo.

Anti-Calvinist. Essays, vi. and vii.

1788. **Holmes** (Robt., *D.D.*) Four Tracts on the Principle of Religion as a test of Divine Authority in the principle of Redemption. 8vo.

The author was a native of Hampshire and educated at New Coll., Oxf. He became Rector of Staunton, Canon of Salisbury, and in 1804, Dean of Winchester.

——— **Forster** (R.) Sermo Academicus pro legum providentia in homine, nondum nata, etiam exstincta matre, servando. 4to. *Lug. Bat.*

1789. **Lazeri** (Peter) MS. De hæresi Pelagiana et Semipelagiana.

This MS. is in the Vatican, and attributed by Caballero to Lazeri. De Backer seems to throw doubt on the authorship, iv., 337.

——— **Rodda** (Richard) The Sovereignty of Grace. 12mo. pp. 24. *Newcastle.*

The author was a Wesleyan.

1789. **Fitch** (Elijah) Poems — Providence.

——— **Cooper** (S.) Free Agency.
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Newton** (James) New Theory of Redemption upon Principles equally agreeable to Revelation and Reason. 2 vols, 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Swain** (Jos.) Redemption, a Poem. 8vo. *Lond.*
Other eds., 1797, 12mo, *Lond.*, [Oxford printed]; 1806, 12mo; *Bost.*, *U.S.*, 1812, 16mo; *Charleston, U.S.*, 1819, pp. 114, 12mo; *Edinb.*, 1814, 12mo; 1822, 12mo; [1830], 12mo; *Lond.*, 1840, 32mo: 1843, 1861, 4to.
The author was a Baptist minister.

——— **Knox** (Will.) Man's Fall and Redemption, &c. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Smythies** (Yorick) Serm. 1 Cor., 3, 9, Co-operation of human benevolence with the Divine. 8vo. *Colchester.*

——— **Backus** (Isaac) The Doctrine of particular Election and final perseverance explained and vindicated. 8vo. *Boston* [*Mass.*]

1790. **Arthur** (Mich.) An Exposition, critical, doctrinal and practical of the Assembly's Shorter Catechism. 3 vols. *Edinb.*
Not in the Brit, Mus.

——— **Oliver** (Tho.) A Full Refutation of the Doctrine of Unconditional Perseverance. 12mo, pp. 191. *Lond.*
The author was a Wesleyan.

——— **Dun** (John) Sermons. 2 vols, 8vo. *Kilmarnock.*
Vol 1, p. 105. Providence (3 Serm.)

——— **Meldrum.**—The Care of Providence over us, and the sin of destroying it, a serm. 8vo. *Manchester.*

[1790]. **Tytler** (James) Letter to Mr. John Barclay on the Doctrine of Assurance.

1790. **Wills** (Wm.) Grace triumphant. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Allinga** (Petrus) The Satisfaction of Christ, stated and defended against the Socinians. 8vo. *Glasgow.*

——— **Dickenson** (Jonathan) God's protecting providence, man's sure help. 12mo.
A Quaker tract.

1791 **Rice** (David) Lect. on Divine Decrees.
An American writer.

——— **Priestley** (Jos.) Unitarian Tracts. 12mo. *Lond.*
2, The Power of man to do the will of God.
3, Original Sin.
4, Election and Reprobation.

——— **Reinhold** (Ch. L.) Beweis ans der Natur Gottes, dass d. göttl-Präscienz Keineswegs gegen die Freiheit der menschl. Handlungen streite. 8vo. *Osnabr.*

1791. **Haweis** (Thomas) Essays on the Evidence, characteristics, doctrines and influence of Christianity. 12mo. *Bath.*
2nd ed.

——— **Murray** (J.) Original Sin.

——— **Hayter** (Thos.) On Faith and Election, preached before University of Camb. pp. 25. *Lond.*

——— **Barnard** (Samuel) The Faith of God's Elect no duty. 8vo. *Hull.*
The author was a dissenting minister, and his pamphlet is in reply to A. McLean's sermon, entitled "The belief of the gospel saving Faith."

——— **Dearle** (E.) A Sure Guide for all Youth, &c. 8vo. *Lond.*
Part 2, Of the creation, fall of man and his recovery.
2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1792, 12mo.

——— **Hervey** (Tho.) Elementa Christiana, the 39 Articles of the Church of England proved to be agreeable to the Word of God in their literal and grammatical sense.

——— **Inglis** (Henry David) Two Letters on Grace. 8vo.
The author was a Baptist divine of Edinburgh.

——— **Parsons** (Edward) The sovereignty of Providence, a serm. 8vo. *Leeds.*
The author was a dissenting minister at Leeds.

[1791]. **Polwhele** (Richard) Discourses. 2nd ed., 2 vols.
Vol 2, a Serm. on A Particular Providence.

1791. **Fleury** (Maria de) Antinomianism unmasked and refuted. 8vo.

——— **Gerbert** (M.) Jansenisticarum controversiarum ex doctrina S. Augustini retractatio. pp. 180, 8vo. *St. Blasii.*

——— **Masden** (Joseph) Divina gratia Augustini a Lutheri, Calvini, Baji, Jansenii et Quesnelli dogmatibus recuperata ac Sancto Doctori restituta publicæ disputationis propositi et ipsi Augustino inter Magistros optimo (Cælestinus P. in Ep. ad Episc. Gall.) D. O. C. ab Aloysio Stramazzi et Angelo Napoleoni Camerini Universitatis Sacræ Theologiæ auditoribus facta cuilibet post tertium arguendi facultate. pp. 116, 4to. *Camerini.*
Masden was a Jesuit, and left a MS. at his death entitled "De gratia Augustiniana," see De Backer, iv., 400.

1792. **Morton** (Joshua) Sermons. 2 vols, 8vo. *Lond.*
Vol. 2, The fall of man and the fall generally; also its consequences.
The 1st ed., 1782.

——— **Weaver** (James) Free Thoughts on the Universal Restoration of all lapsed Intelligences from the Ruins of the Fall, with Thoughts on the Origin of Evil. 8vo. *Lond.*

1792. **Butterworth** (Lawrence) Thoughts on Moral Government and Agency, and the Origin of Moral Evil. 8vo. *Evesham.*

The views of both Priestley and Lindsey are criticized.

——— **Cowper** (Will.) The power of grace, illustrated in 6 letters, translated from the Latin by W. C. 8vo. *Edinb.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

The translator was the well-known poet.

——— **Malham** (John) 16 Sermons. 8vo. *Lond.*

The nature of God's moral government applied to men, and the effect of Adam's transgression, etc.

——— **Sturges** (John, *LL.D.*) Discourses. 8vo. *Lond.*

P. 1, The natural evidences of the being of a God, of a providence and of a future state, with an appendix, p. 387, on Mr. Hume's essay on a Particular Providence and a future state.

The author was Preb. of Winchester, 1759.

1793. Kurze Darstellung der Philosophie in ihrer neuesten Gestalt. pp. 451, 8vo. *Leip.*

——— Versuch einer Geschichte der Meinungen über Schicksal und menschliche Freiheit, von den ältesten Zeiten an bis auf die neuesten Denker; als des neuen Versuchs zur Theodicæ dritter Theil. 8vo. *Leipzic.*

——— **Werdermann** (J. C. Gunther) Attempt at a History of Opinions respecting Fate and Freewill, from the most ancient times to the most recent Philosophers. 8vo. *Leips.*

——— **Macdonald** (Andrew) 29 Miscellaneous Sermons. 4th ed., 8vo. *Lond.*

One on Providence vindicated in the mixture of good and evil that appears in the world.

——— **Zola** (Jos.) Historia Pelagiana. 8vo. *Ticini.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Crombie** (Alex., *LL.D.*) An Essay on Philosophical Necessity. pp. 508, 8vo. *Lond.*

The author was a native of Aberdeen and Pastor of a Presbyterian congregation in London.

——— **Bates** (Ely) Observations on some important points in Divinity, chiefly those in controversy between the Arminians and Calvinists. 12mo. *Lond.*

They are mostly extracts from Baxter. The author advocates a middle course. The 2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1811, pp. 315, 12mo, contains additional extracts from Bp. Stillingfleet and the Rev. John Howe on the Nature and Conditionality of the Gospel Covenant.

This 2nd ed. only in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Young** (Jos.) Calvinism and Universalism Contrasted. pp. xx., 124, 12mo or 18mo. *New York.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

The author was a Universalist.

1793. **Mason** (Edw.) The order of Providence in respect to the different ranks and stations of men. Two Serm. 4to.

——— **Fuller** (And.) The Calvinistic and Socinian systems examined and compared as to their moral tendency. 8vo. *Lond.*

Other eds., 1794, 1796, 1802, 1815, 8vo; Repub. as No. 8 of Ward's Lib. of Standard Divinity.

"A most valuable work with much power of reasoning and unction of spirit."—*Bickersteth.*

Robt. Hall says of Fuller that he "was a man whose sagacity enabled him to penetrate to the depths of every subject he explored." The work has been overrated. The writer had evidently studied the Calvinistic side, but had a mistaken view of the Arminian. He was a Baptist, but of the same school as Scot, and wrote letters on Universal Salvation, and on the Reality and Efficacy of Divine Grace. He d. 1815.

——— **Disney** (John, *D.D.*) Sermons. 4 vols, 8vo. *Lond.*

Vol 1, p. 263. Man accountable for his actions, consistently with God's government of the world: vol 3, p. 327. Natural and Moral Evil.

The author was chaplain to Bp. Law, and Vicar of Swinderley, but subsequently joined the Unitarians. Also author of a Serm. on "Trust and confidence in the universal and sovereign government, and constant providence of God," *Lond.*, 1803, 8vo.

——— Infant Salvation, an Essay to prove the salvation of all who die in Infancy. pp. 48, 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Keleph Ben Nathan.**—La Philosophie Divine appliquée a la liberté, et a l'esclavage de l'homme, au peche originel, &c. 8vo. *S.L.*

Rare.

1794. **Wintle** (Thos.) The expediency, prediction and accomplishment of the Christian Redemption. 8vo. *Oxf.*

In vol 1 of his Christian Ethics, *Oxf.*, 1812, 2 vols, 8vo, he has a discourse on "Eternal life as the free gift of God," and in vol 2, one on "The grace of mercy."

The author was a clergyman of the Church of England, a B.D. and Fell. of Pembroke, b. 1737, d. 1814.

——— **Alcott** (Jos.) Jesus King of Saints, or Christ's Sovereignty in delivering his Elect from the power of Sin, Satan, Death and the Grave.

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Nokesius** (Gul.) Dissertatio in lege Socinianis Arminianis opposita. *Lond.*

——— **Ramsey** (And. Mich.) An extract from Ramsey's explanation of Saint Paul's Ep. to the Romans, but more particularly of the 8th, 9th, 10th, and 11th chapters. 8vo. *Lond.*

In his "Philosophical principles of natural and revealed religion unfolded in geometrical order," *Glasg.*, 1748, 2 vols, 4to, he deals with the attributes of God and the condition of man.

The author is known as Chevalier Ramsey.

1794. **Jardine** (David B.) The unpurchased love of God in the Redemption. 8vo. *Lond.*

The author was a minister of the Unitarian chapel, Bath.

——— **Lovell** (Sam.) The Mystery of Providence and Grace, &c., two Serm. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Fawcett** (Jas.) Sermons preached before the Univ. of Cambridge. 8vo. *Camb.*

p. 165, the Redemption of man universal.

The author was Lady Margaret Preacher in the Univ. of Cambridge. "These sermons are truly academic. They afford young preachers a happy example of the manner in which ingenious speculation may be united with practical utility." —*Monthly Rev.*

——— **Plotinus.**—Five books, viz., on the nature and origin of evil; on providence, etc., Transl. with an Intro. by Thos. Taylor. 8vo. *Lond.*

1795. **Cappe** (Newcome) Discourses on the providence and government of God. 8vo. *Lond.*

A Unitarian minister, d. 1800.

A 2nd ed., *York*, 1811, 8vo; 3rd ed., *York*, 1818, 12mo.

"In our judgment the most eloquent sermon writer of modern times."—*Lon. Monthly Repository.*

"There is a great portion of very perverted ingenuity and strained criticism." —*Orme.*

The latter judgment is truer than the former.

——— **Burder** (Samuel) The Moral law considered as a Rule of Life to Believers, designed as an antidote to Antinomianism. 8vo. *Lond.*

The author was a member of Clare Hall, Camb, and Lecturer of Christ's Church, Newgate Street, and St. Leonard's, Foster Lane, London. He was the Editor of an edition of Owen's Display of Arminianism (1809, 8vo), being a pronounced Calvinist.

——— Passages of Scripture relating to Original Sin, Election and Reprobation, etc. 12mo. *Warrington.*

——— Necessitarian. Illustrations of Mr. Hume's Essay concerning Liberty and Necessity. pp. 44, 8vo. *Lond.*

This is in answer to Dr. Gregory of Edinb.

1796. **Edwards** (Jon., the eld.) Remarks on important Theological controversies. pp. 480. 8vo. *Edinb.*

Contains, God's moral government—The Divine decrees—The perseverance of saints, and a serm. on God's Sovereignty in the salvation of men—Also to be found in vol 2 of Works, *Lond.*, 1834, 2 vols, imp. 8vo.

——— **Huntington** (Jos., *D.D.*) Calvinism improved; or the Gospel illustrated as a system of Real Grace issuing in the Salvation of all men. pp. 331. 8vo. *New Lond.* (*Conn.*)

Dr. Huntington was educated at Yale Coll., and in 1763 ordained Pastor of the Church in Coventry, Conn., U.S.

——— **Strong** (Nathan, *D.D.*) The doctrine of Eternal misery consistent with the Infinite Benevolence of God. 8vo. *Harford* [*U. S.*]

The author was Pastor of the first ch., Hartford (Conn., U. S.) 1774, d. 1816. A critical examination of his work by Foster (Dan.) 1803, 8vo.

1796. **Hey** (John, *D.D.*) Lectures in Divinity. 4 vols. 8vo. *Camb.*

Book 4. Other eds., *Camb.*, 1822, 8vo; 1841, 2 vols, 8vo. The author was Rector of Calverton.

——— **Williams** (Will.) Redemption, a sacred poem. 4to.

Not in the Brit. Mus.

[1796.] **Bennet** (John) Redemption, a poem. 8vo. *Oxford.*

[1797.] **Appleton** (Jesse, *D.D.*) Works.

Sect. 44 and 45—Election. The author was second Pres. of Bowden Coll., U. S., d. 1819. Only ed. in Brit. Mus., *Andover*, [*U. S.*] 1837. 2 vols, 8vo.

1797. **Meikle** (James) Metaphysical Maxims, or thoughts on the nature of Freewill, and the Divine Prescience. pp. xii. 142. 12mo. *Edinb.*

Another ed., *Edinb.*, 1805, 12mo.

[1797.] **Gyfford** (R.) Lyric Poems on the attributes of the Supreme Being. 12mo. *Lond.*

1797. **Erskine** (Ralph) Gospel Sonnets, or Spiritual songs in six parts concerning Creation and Redemption. 8vo. *Edinb.*

Another ed., 1844, 24mo. The author was minister at Dumfermline, 1711, and joined the seceders, 1734. The Seceders accused the rulers of verging towards Neonomian or semi-Arminian principles, arising out of the fact that the General Assembly had condemned a book entitled "The Marrow of Modern Divinity," a work written on strict Calvinistic principles.

——— **Kershaw** (Jas.) The Grand extensive plan of human Redemption. pp. 289. 12mo. *Louth.*

——— **Fawcett** (John. *D.D.*) an Essay on the Wisdom, the Equity, and Bounty of Divine Providence. *Lond.*

——— **Clements** (Will.) Eight sermons. 8vo. *Lond.*

p. 58. The Fall and Redemption. The author was Curate of St. Mary-at-hill, London, and librarian of Sion Coll. He d. 1799, aged 88.

——— **Edwards** (Jonathan, the younger) Dissertation on Liberty and Necessity. 8vo. *Worcester* (*Mass., U. S.*)

The author was President of Union Coll., Schenectady, and pub. 3 sermons on "The Necessity of atonement and the consistency between that and free grace in forgiveness."—*New Haven*, 1785, 8vo. Another ed., 1853, 8vo. Also of "The Salvation of all men strictly examined."—*New Haven* [*U. S.*] 1790, 8vo.

[1798.] **Bradford** (John) The final perseverance of the Saints, a serm. 8vo. *Lond.*

1798. **Leigh** (Wm.) The Interposition of Divine Providence illustrated, a serm. 4to. *Lond.*

——— **Kirwan** (Rich.) Essay on Human Liberty.

1798. **Archard.** A Philosophic Discourse on Providence addressed to the Modern Philosophers of Gt. Britain. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Clarke** (Thomas Brooke) Proofs of Providence, a sermon preached on account of the Battle of the Nile. 12mo. *Lond.*

——— **Butcher** (Edm.) Sermons. 8vo. *Lond.*

p. 216, Rom. ix, 21. The Sovereignty of God. The author was a Unitarian minister.

——— **Tucker** (W.) Predestination calmly considered from principles of Reason in consistency with the nature of things, etc. pp. 194. 12mo. *Lond.*

This Calvinistic work is very rare, only one copy ever having been met with by the writer. A 3rd ed., *Lond.*, 1821, 12mo, in which are added "Brief thoughts on original sin."—Reprinted *Boston*, [*U. S.*], 1835.

——— **Hill** (Sir Rich.) An apology for Brotherly Love, and for the Doctrines of the Church of England. 8vo. *Lond.*

The author was a Calvinistic Methodist, and brother of the celebrated Rowland Hill.—"A better man than Sir Rich. Hill I do not know within the circle of human nature."—*Lord Kenyon.*

——— **Browne** (John) An Essay on Universal Redemption. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Scott** (Thos.) Doctrines of Election and Final Perseverance stated from scripture. 8vo. *Lond.*

In vol 10 of his collected works, *Lond.*, 1823, 10 vols, 8vo, p. 202, is an article on "Predestination not inconsistent with free agency;" and in his "Village Discourses," *Lond.*, 1825, 12mo, he deals with the condition of man under the fall. The author was the well known commentator.

——— **Daubeny** (Chas., *D.D.*) A Guide to the Church. 3 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*

2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1804, 2 vols; 3rd ed., *Lond.*, 1830, 8vo. The author was educated at New Col., Oxford, and became Preb. of Salisbury, 1784, and Archdeacon of Sarum, 1804.

——— **Fellowes** (Robert) Christian Philosophy. 8vo.

2nd ed., 1799, 8vo, and a supplement. The author was Editor of the Critical Review, and the work is in favour of Arminianism.

1799. **Tomline** (Geo., *D.D.*, *Bishop of Lincoln*) Elements of Christian Theology. *Lond.*

Various ed., the 13th, *Lond.*, 1837, pp. 661, 8vo. Contains an Exposition of the 39 Articles—Art. X and XVII. A valuable work for students.

——— **Golledge** (John) Strictures on an Essay on Philosophical Necessity. by Alex. Crombie. 12mo. *Lond.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

This work contains an Appendix shewing in various particulars the affinity between Necessity and Predestination.

[1799.] **Rees** (Will. Jenk.) Unconditional Election and its dependent doctrines disapproved.

This is an abridgment of Whitby on the Five Points, and is of course Arminian.]

1799. **Sellon** (Walter) The Church of England vindicated from the charge of Absolute Predestination. 8vo. *Lond.*

Also in Collected Works, *Lond.*, 1814, p. 351. This is a refutation of Toplady. It is of course Anti-Calvinist.

——— Gesch. d. Eutstehung der Remonstranten, d. damit verbund. Unruhen w. d. dadurch veraulassten Dortrechter Synode. 8vo. *Osnab.*

1799—1812. **Burder** (Geo.) Village Sermons. 6 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*

Discourses on the Fall of Man, and his redemption—the Sovereignty of God, and the doctrine of Providence. Various other ed., the best, *Lond.*, 1838, 8 vols, 12mo. The author was a native of London, and Minister of the Independent Chapel, Fetter Lane. "Burder's Village Sermons are highly & deservedly popular, and very useful."—*Lowndes; Bickersteth.*

1799. **Riddock** (Jas.) Sermons. 3 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*

Another ed., *Lond.*, 1807, 3 vols, 8vo; 5th ed., 1831, 3 vols, 8vo. In vol 2, Serm. on Providence. The author was one of the ministers of St. Paul's (Episcopal) Chapel, Aberdeen.

——— **Williams** (Thomas) A Vindication of the Calvinistic doctrines of human depravity, the Atonement, Divine influences, &c., in a series of letters. 8vo. *Lond.*

1800—1888.

1800. **Fellowes** (Rob.) The Anti-Calvinist. 8vo. *Oxon.*
2nd ed., *Lond.*, pp. 28, 8vo.

——— **Horne** (W. W.) Sermons. 8vo.
(Election.)

——— **Hill** (Sir Rich.) Daubenism refuted and Martin Luther vindicated.
8vo. *Lond.*
Also author of a Review of Wesley's doctrine, being replies to Fletcher, and Strictures on Fletcher, in which he treats of Election; also "Logica Wesliensis," in which he treats of the same subject.

——— **Gregory** (Will.) A Visible display of divine Providence. 8vo. *Lond.*

[1800.] **Allen** (John, *M.D.*) Illustrations of Mr. Hume's Essay concerning Liberty and Necessity.

[1800.] **Bangs** (Nathan, *D.D.*) Predestination examined.
Not in the Brit. Mus.
The author was a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church in America, and the author of "Life of Arminius." He was editor of "The Christian Advocate and Journal."

[1800.] Anti-Calvinist. Y Weinidogaeth lwyddiannus ; neu Ymddiddan...rhwug .....Calfin ac Anti-Calfin. 12mo.

1800. **Culy** (David) The Glory of the Two Crown'd Heads, &c., to which is annexed Martin Luther's Letter on Predestination. 12mo. *Plymouth.*
Another ed., *Spilsby*, 1820, 12mo.

——— **Dickinson** (John) The True Scripture Doctrine concerning some important points of Christian Faith.
12mo. *Chambersburg.*
Treats of Eternal Election, Original Sin, Grace, and the Saint's perseverance.

1801. **Fellowes** (Rob.) Religion without cant. 8vo.
(Arminian.)

——— Answer to an anonymous letter (dated Sept. 18, 1777), on Predestination and Freewill. pp. 55. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Jones** (Wm., *of Nayland*) Theological Works. 12 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*
Amongst other things, vol 7 contains a Discourse on Calling and Election, and vol 12, two letters to a Predestinarian. Another ed., in 6 vols, *Lond.*, 1810, 8vo. The author was imbued with the theology of Hutchinson, and converted Bishop Horne to that creed. He is bitter to Calvinism. Perpetual Curate of Nayland, and in 1798, Rector of Hollingbourn, d. 1800.

1801. **Magee** (Wm, *D.D.*) Discourses and Dissertations on the Scripture doctrine of Atonement and Sacrifice.
8vo. *Lond.*
A standard work. Other ed., 1812, 2 vols, 8vo, 1816, 3 vols, 8vo; 1817, 8vo; 5th ed., 1832; 3 vols, 8vo; 1834, 3 vols, 8vo ; 1841, 8vo. Also in vol 1 of Collected Works, 2 vols, *Lond.*, 1842, 8vo. The author was Bishop of Raphoe, 1819, and Archbp. of Dublin, 1822. See *Allibone* ii, 120, *Orme*, p. 305.

——— [**Jerram** (Chas.)] Letters to an Universalist, by Scrutator. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Overton** (John) The True Churchmen ascertained. 8vo. *York.*
2nd ed., *York*, 1802, pp. 424, 8vo. The author was Rector of St. Margaret and St. Crux, York. The above work is Calvinistic. A reply to such parts of this work as concern the publications of *T.* Ludlam, *Leicester*, 1802, pp. 26, 8vo.

——— **Archer** (James) A Second Series of Sermons. 3 vols. 12mo. *Lond.*
Vol 3, p. 145. Confidence in Divine Providence. Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Baseley** (J.) Sermons.
8vo. *Lond.*
p. 71, Liberty and Necessity.

——— **Milner** (Joseph) Sermons.
3 vols. 8vo. *Camb.*
Vol 1, p. 1, Original sin. p. 63, The case of Pharaoh; p. 192, The doctrine of Providence. Other ed., *Lond.*, 1804—23, 3 vols, 8vo; 1830, 8vo. The author is the well known ecclesiastical historian, In a "Selection of his tracts and essays, *Lond.*, 1810, 8vo, will be found one on The "Efficacy of divine grace."

——— **Gessner** (J. At. W.) Uber den Ursprung des sittlich Bösen in Menschen. 8vo. *Leip.*

——— **Rogers** (C.) Husbandman's aim.
(Predestination.)

——— **Sharp** (G.) Answer on Predestination.

——— **Whitaker** (Edward Will.) Family Sermons. 2nd ed.
3 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*
Vol 1, On the Providence of God. The author was Curate of St. John's, Clerkenwell, and afterwards Rector of St. Mildred's and All Saints', Canterbury, d. 1818, aged 68.

——— **Cobbold** (John Spencer) Two plain discourses on the subjects of Predestination and Grace. 8vo. *Ipswich.*
Scarce—never met but the copy in the Brit. Mus.

1802. Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ Articulus XVII.....cum quibusdam excerptis e Calvini Institutionibus Collatus.
pp. 14. 8vo. *Bathoniæ.*
The object of this pamphlet is to prove that our Reformers paid peculiar deference to the sentiments and language of Calvin, when drawing up the Articles.

——— **Pearson** (Ed., *D.D.*) Remarks on the Controversy subsisting between the Arminians and Calvinists. 8vo. *Lond.*
Anti-Calvinist. The author was Rector of Rempstone, Notts., and Vice-Chancellor of Camb., 1808. See Gent. Mag., 1811, pt. 2, 198, 665.

——— **Kipling** (Thos., *D.D.*) The Articles of the Church of England proved not to be Calvinistic.
pp. 91. 8vo. *Camb.*
The author was Dean of Peterborough, and the work was written in answer to Overton's "True Churchmen ascertained." It is a valuable little work—concise and sound.

——— **Academicus.** Remarks on a Pamphlet by Thos. Kipling, *D.D.*, Dean of Peterborough, entitled "The Articles of the Church of England, proved not to be Calvinistic." 8vo. *Cambridge.*
Calvinistic.

——— **Lindsey.** Conversations on Divine Government.

——— **Gilpin** (Wm.) Sermons.
4 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*
Vol 1, 3rd ed., p. 179, The Providence of God. The author was Vicar of Boldre in the New Forest, and Preb. of Salisbury.

——— **Koch** (F. L.) Diss. de Deo pœnas eas, quæ per ipsam naturam et e physico causarum nexu peccata sequi dicuntur, remittente. 4to. *Torgau.*

——— **Amicus.** Reflections on the fall and redemption of Man, in metre.
8vo. *Bristol.*

[1802.] **Beaty** (Francis) The last Speech, Confession, and dying words of that enemy of all Righteousness, known by the name of the Imputation of the guilt of Adam's original sin to all his posterity, &c. 8vo. *Lond.*

1802. **Stephens** (Sam.) An Address to the people called Quakers and others on the fallen State of Man.
8vo. *Dublin.*

1803. A Reply to Academicus in a letter by a friend of Dr. Kipling.
Anti-Calvinist.

——— **Daubeny** (Chas.) Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ. 8vo. *Bath.*
Anti-Calvinist.

——— [**Haweis** (Dr.)] The Church of England vindicated from misrepresentation, &c. By a Presb. of the Ch. of Eng.

——— **Parnell** (T.) Glance upon Predestination.

——— **Pott** (Jos. Holden) Considerations on the general conditions of the Christian covenant, with a view to some important controversies. *Lond.*
The author was Preb. of Lincoln, 1785; Rector of St. Olave, Jewry, and St. Martin's, Ironmonger Lane, 1787; Preb. of St. Paul's, 1822; Vicar of Kensington, 1824, and Chancellor of Exeter, 1826.

1803. **Rowe** (John) The Control of Providence over the actions and purposes of Men. A Serm. 8vo. *Bristol.*
The author was a Unitarian.

——— **Pretyman** (Geo., *D.D., Bishop of Lincoln*) A charge delivered to the Clergy of Lincoln.
Arminian.

——— **Winchester** (Thos., *D.D.*) A Dissertation on the XVIIth Article.
The author ascertains the sentiments of the compilers and other contemporary Reformers on the subject of the Divine Decrees. A 2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1808, 8vo, in the Churchman's Remembrancer, vol 1. See 1773.

——— **Fletcher** (John) Works.
8 vols. 12mo. *Lond.*
Vol 2, Three Checks to Antinomianism—vol 3, Checks to Antinomianism—vol 4, An equal check to Pharisaism and Antinomianism—vol 5, Bible Arminianism and Bible Calvinism—vol 6, The last check to Antinomianism—vol 7, Answer to Toplady's Vindication of the Decrees, and Reply to Arguments for absolute necessity. Many editions of Fletcher's works, 1806, 10 vols, 8vo; 1825, 7 vols, 12mo. The author was Rector of Madeley, Salop, and a great admirer and supporter of Wesley.

——— Extracts from the True Doctrine of Divine Predestination. 8vo.

——— **Faber** (Geo. Stanley) Thoughts on the Calvinistic and Arminian Controversy. 8vo. *Lond.*
The author was Master of Sherburn Hospital, and Preb. of Salisbury, and one of the Fellows and Tutors of Lincoln Coll., before he had reached his 21st year.—See *Gent. Mag.*, May, 1854.

——— **Wynpersse** (S. J. van de) Oratio Inauguralis, de Amore Dei erga se ipsum, omnis veræ salutis, omnis inter homines juris, omniumque nostrorum officiorum, fonte. 4to. *Lug. Bat.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **De Joux** (Peter) Prédication du Christianisme, ou vérités de la religion Chrétienne, exposées dans une suite de sermons et de prières.
3 vols. 8vo. *Gen.*
Vol 1, p. 53, La Providence justifiée; vol 3, p. 253, Le libre arbitre.

——— **Gleig** (Geo., *LL.D.*) Sermons.
8vo. *Edin.*
p. 301, Providence in the laws of nature. The author was one of the Bishops of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, Primus, 1816.

——— **Eberstein** (W. L. G. Baron von) Natural Theology of the Schoolmen, with supplement on their Doctrine of Freewill. 8vo. *Leips.*
Not in Brit. Mus.

1803. **Hopkins** (Sam., *D.D.*) 21 Sermons. 8vo. *Salem.*

Three on "The Decrees of God the foundation of piety"; these are also in vol 2 of Collected Works, *Boston*, 3 vols, 8vo; and in vol 3, p. 148, will be found "A dialogue between a Calvinist and a semi-Calvinist," and p. 579, "How Christians work out their own salvation," 6 serms. The author was the founder of the Hopkinsonian school of divinity, and studied under the celebrated Jonathan Edwards. "Hopkins sought to add to the five points of Calvinism, the rather heterogeneous ingredient that holiness consists in pure, disinterested benevolence, and that all regard for self is necessarily sinful."—*Hildreth's Hist. of the U. States.* "The System of Doctrines," 2nd ed., *Boston* [*U. S.*], 1811, 2 vols, 8vo.

——— **Smith** (John Pye, *D.D.*, *LL.D.*) The Divine Glory displayed in the Permission of Sin. A Serm. 8vo. *Lond.*

Also a discourse on Redemption, *Lond.*, 1828, 8vo, which went to several editions. The author was theological tutor of the dissenting academy at Homerton and a Calvinist.

1804. **Wright** (Richard) Letters on Election. 8vo. *Edin.*

Another ed., *Wisbech*, 1806. The author was a Unitarian missionary. The letters are able but not sound. Wright was the author of "The Anti-Satisfactionist, or the salvation of sinners by the free grace of God," *Wisbech*, 1805, pp. 412, 8vo, and 1807, 8vo.

——— [**Hill** (Sir Rich.)] Remarks on a Charge delivered by the Bishop of Lincoln at the Triennial Visitation, 1803. By an old member of Parl.

——— **Law** (Geo. Hen., *D.D.*. *Preb. of Carlisle*) The Limit to our Enquiries with respect to the Nature and Attributes of the Deity.

See *Gent. Mag.*, 1845, pt. 2, 529.

——— An original Letter from a Gent. to his Friend giving a short account of a work entitled "Pia et Catholica Institutio," intended as a vindication of Archbp. Cranmer from the charges of inconsistency and Arminianism.

——— **Durham** (James George) The Providence of God—a Norrisian Prize Essay. 8vo.

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Baldwin** (Thos., *D.D.*) The Eternal Purpose of God, the foundation of effectual calling. A Serm.

2nd ed. 8vo. *Boston* [*U.S.*]

——— **Collet** (Jos.) A Discourse on the Mysteries of Divine Providence.

8vo. *Dunstable.*

1805. **Airenti** (Guiseppe Vincenzo) De opere Redemptionis atque ejus causis. 8vo.

——— Traité abr. de la S. Volonté de Dieu, etc., par un Trappiste de la Val. Ste. 16mo. *Lyon.*

——— **Overton** (John) Four Letters to the Editor of the Christian Observer.

8vo. *Lond.*

1805. An Examination of the Rev. C. Daubeny's "Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ."

Anti-Calvinistic.

——— **Laurence** (Rich., *LL.D.*) An Attempt to illustrate those articles which the Calvinists improperly consider as Calvinistic, being the Bampton Lecture for 1804. pp. 460, 8vo. *Oxf.*

Several eds. 2nd, *Lond.*, 1820, 8vo; 3rd, 1838, 8vo; 4th, *Oxf.*, 1853, 8vo, pp. 423.

The author was Rector of Mersham, Kent, Regius Prof. of Hebrew and Canon of Christ Church, Oxf., 1814; Archbp. of Cashel, 1822. The object of the work is to trace the articles usually controverted by the Calvinists up to their genuine sources, to compare them with the peculiar opinions of their own times, and thus to determine their meaning with more certainty by ascertaining the precise objects which their compilers had in view. It is one of the most valuable and accurate works in opposition to Calvinism.

——— **Wilkinson** (T.) Milner's Ecclesiastical History reviewed, and the origin of Calvinism considered.

Anti-Calvinistic.

This is not apparently in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Williams** (Ed., *D.D.*) Predestination to Life. A Sermon.

8vo. *Rotherham.*

Assigned to [1805] in the Brit. Mus. To it are added explanatory notes on the subjects of Predestination and the Origin of Moral Evil.

This sermon raised a controversy, in which the hypothesis was controverted by Mr. Parry of Wynouddy, and Mr. Bennett, and defended by Mr. Gilbert of Hull.

——— **Onslow** (Dr. Arth.) The Scriptural Analogy and Concord of St. Paul and St. James on Christian Faith. A Sermon.

——— **Smith** (Elias) The Doctrine of the Prince of Peace and his Servants concerning the End of the Wicked.

pp. 71, 12mo. *Boston.*

Written to prove that the Doctrines of the Universalists and Calvinists are not the doctrines of Jesus Christ and the apostles.

[1805]. Byrr hanes o frwyd Iago Arminius. 8vo.

[1805]. [**Wesley** (J.)] Y gwahaniaeth rhwng, Mr. Wesley a Mr. Whitfield, &c. 8vo. *Dolgollen.*

1805. **Drummond** (Sir W.) Academical Questions. 4to. *Lond.*

(Providence).

Vol 1, all published.

A work of great acuteness and full of shrewd, well-written, but subtle and sophistical reasoning. He assumes that nothing but material substance can exist. He endows matter with the uncreated forces to put it in motion.

——— **Bradley** (S.) The Mystery and Equity of Providence. A Sermon.

8vo. *Manchester.*

——— **Davies** (John) Character and Final Perseverance of the Righteous. A Serm. 8vo. *Lond.*

The author was minister of St. Margaret's Chapel, Westminster.

1805. **Griffin** (John) The encouraging aspect of the times in connexion with the events of Providence. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Collyer** (Wm. Bengo, *D.D.*) The Mysteries of Providence. A Sermon. 8vo. *Lond.*

The author was minister of the Independent Chapel, Peckham, and d. 1854.

——— **Adams** (John) Sermons on the Existence of the Deity, &c. 8vo. *Lond.*

Pp. 47. Providence.

The author was Master of the Academy at Pulteney.

——— **Burnaby** (And., *D.D.*) Occasional Sermons and Charges 8vo. *Deptford.*

Pp. 154. The designs of Providence effected by natural means.

The author was a native of Ashfordy, Leicestershire. He was educated at Westminster and Queen's Coll., Camb. Vicar of Greenwich, 1769, and Archdeacon of Leicester, 1786. His sermons and charges have been highly esteemed.

——— **Lawson** (Geo., *D.D.*) Lectures on Ruth, Discourse on Sovereign Grace. 12mo. *Edinb.*

Another ed., *Lond.*, 1809, 12mo.

The author was for 33 years Prof. of Divinity to the Associate Synod of the Burgher Secession Church, Scotland, and for 49 years pastor of the Associate Congregation of Selkirk.

——— **Moncreiff** (Sir Hen. Wellwood, *D.D.*) Sermons. 8vo. *Edinb.*

Containing: The Unequal allotments of Providence—The innate improvement of the blessings of Providence—The doctrine of Grace—The Conduct of Providence to good men.

2nd ed., *Edinb.*, 1807, 8vo.

The author was a minister of the Chnrch of Scotland.

1806. **Bourdaloue** (Louis) Select Sermons (Translated). 8vo. *Harlow.*

Pp. 235. On Providence.

——— **Brackenbury** (Ed.) Fifty-three Discourses. 2 vols, 8vo. *Lond.*

Vol 1, pp. 85, The Fall of Man; p. 101, Providence; p. 129, Original and Actual Sin. Vol 2, p. 15, Perseverance: p. 29, Assurance.

——— **Primitive Truth, in a History of the Internal State of the Reformation, expressed by the Early Reformers in their writings.** *Lond.*

Anti-Calvinistic.

——— **Smith** (John Pye) Letters to the Rev. Thos. Belsham on some important subjects of theological discussion.

Calvinistic.

——— **Ryder** (Hon. and Rev. Henry) A Serm. on the Doctrine of Final Perseverance and Assurance of Salvation. 8vo. *Lond.*

The author was Dean of Wells, 1812; Bp. of Worcester, 1815; and of Lichfield and Coventry, 1824.—*See Gent. Mag.*, 1836, pt. i., 658.

[1806]. **Bailey** (John) The Justification of God's Elect. 8vo. *Sevenoaks.*

Also author of "Growth in Grace," *Lond.*, 1808, 8vo.

The author was a Baptist Minister.

1806. **Fuller** (A.) Dialogues, Letters and Essays on various subjects. pp. 306, 12mo. *Lond.*

P. 28, Free Agency of Man; p. 41, Antinomianism; p. 47, Human depravity. Also author of "Strictures on Sandemanism," 2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1811, pp. 241, 12mo.

[1806]. **Sutcliffe** (Joseph) Four Serm. 8vo. *Halifax.*

One on Assurance.

The author was a Wesleyan.

1806. **Klugling** (K. F. H.) Ueber den Anthropomorphism der Bibel in den Verstellungen von Gott, dessen Erklärung u. Gebrauch beim Volks—u. Jugendunterrichte. 8vo. *Danzig.*

——— **Botomley** (S.) Grace displayed.

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Creuzer** (G. Frid.) Philosophorum veterum loci de providentia divina, itemque de fato, emendantur. 4to. *Heidelb.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Taylor** (Thos.) The Reconciler; or, an humble attempt.....to Reconcile the Experimental Calvinists with the Experimental Arminians. pp. 587, 8vo. *Liverp.*

——— **Carpenter** (Dr. Lant.) Discourse on Divine Providence. 8vo. *Exeter.*

Also author of "Lectures on the Atonement," *Lond* [Manchester printed], 1843, 12mo; "On the Will of God as the Principle of Duty," *Lond.*, 1837, 8vo; "The Scripture Doctrine of Redemption," *Boston* [*Mass.*], 1831, 12mo; "On Divine Influences," *Bristol*, 1822, 12mo.

See 1820.

1807. **Davies** (Owen) Dialogues between two neighbours, the Berean and his Instructor, showing the errors of Calvinism. pp. xxx., 376, 12mo. *Caerlleon, Chester.*

Written in Welsh.

——— **Barnes** (John) An Essay on Fate.

This was published when the author was but 14.

——— **Bevan** (Jos. Gurney) Of Freewill. *Lond.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

The author was a Quaker, and the same year wrote "The Life of the Apostle Paul."

——— The Churchman's Remembrancer. 2 vols, 8vo. *Lond.*

This is a collection of scarce and valuable tracts in defence of the doctrine and discipline of the Church. It contains Dr. Winchester's *Diss. on the 17th Article* (1773), Plaifere's *Appello Evangelium*, &c.

——— **Partridge** (Sam.) The rich Ministers of Divine Providence. 8vo.

——— **Belsham** (Thos.) The Providence of God overruling the issues of War and Conquest. 8vo. *Lond.*

The author was a Unitarian, best known for his translation of the Epistles of St. Paul. In his "Elements of the Philosophy of the Mind," *Lond.*, 1801, 8vo, he deals elaborately with liberty and necessity, taking the Necessarian view.

1807. **Ady** (John) The Harmony of the Divine Will. 8vo.
Another ed., *Lond.*, 1811.

[1807]. **Blackburn** (Noah) Attachment to the world lamented, and a Throne of Grace petitioned; or, the distressed saints seeking quickening grace. A Serm. pp. 26, 8vo. *Manchester.*

1808. **Coutts** (Rob.) Sermons. 2nd ed., 8vo. *Lond.*
A sermon on the Unsearchableness of Providence.
3rd ed., *Edinb.*, 1847. 12mo. No 1st ed. in Brit. Mus.
The author was a native of Brechin, Scotland.

——— **Doncaster** (John) The Election of Grace and the Reprobation of Justice. pp. 34, 8vo. *Halifax.*
The author was a Wesleyan.

[1808]. **Bailly** (Louis) De Gratia.
Not in the Brit. Mus.

1808. **Parry** (W.) Origin of Moral Evil. 8vo.
This is an investigation of Dr. Williams's theory.

———**Gilbert** (J.) A Reply to "Remarks on a recent hypothesis respecting the origin of Moral Evil," etc. 8vo.

——— **Hill** (Thos.) Animadversions on Parry's Strictures on the origin of Moral Evil. 8vo.

——— **Brocas** (Thos.) Universal Goodness. 2nd ed., 12mo. *Shrewsbury.*

——— ——— God no respecter of persons. 12mo. *Shrewsbury.*

——— **MacCulla** (V.) Adam's primeval state proved spiritual; .....in correspondence with a professed Lapsarian [William Curtis]. 8vo.

——— **Eddowes** (Ralph) On the supposed inability of man to do anything towards his own salvation. 8vo.
The author was a Unitarian.

1809. **Evans** (John) The Doctrine of Philosophical Necessity considered in reference to its tendency.

——— **Adam** (Robert) The religious world displayed. 3 vols, 8vo. *Edinb.*
Vol 2 contains Calvinists, Arminians, and Antinomians.
Another ed. appeared in 2 vols, *Lond.*, 1823, 8vo.

——— **Smyth** (Edward) St. Paul against Calvin; or, an Exposition of Rom. IX. 12mo. *Lond.*

——— **Drummond** (T.) On the Origin of Evil. Two Discourses.
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Macdonald** (W.) Truth established in proving T. Brocas's Universal Goodness to be Universal Nonsense. 8vo.

[1809]. **Stevens** (John) Doctrinal Antinomianism refuted. 8vo. *Boston.*

1809. **Morehead** (Rob., *D.D.*) A Series of Discourses on the principles of religious belief. 2 vols, 8vo. *Edinb.*
Vol 1—Man as a natural and moral being; also as a religious being. Vol 2—A Divine Providence and the Providence of God with respect to nations.
The 4th ed., *Edinb.*, 1811—1816, 2 vols, 8vo.
The author was rector of Easington, Co. York, 1840.

——— **Pratt** (Jonah) Bishop Hopkins' Doctrine of the two Covenants, wherein the nature of Original Sin is at large explained. pp. 100, 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Williams** (Ed., *D.D.*) An Essay on the Equity of Divine Government and the Sovereignty of Divine Grace. pp. 558, 8vo. *Lond.* [*Shrewsbury printed*].
Mostly in answer to Whitby on the 5 Points.
2nd ed. *Lond.*, 1813, 8vo; 3rd ed. 1825, 8vo.
Dr. Williams professes to examine what he calls the latitudinarian hypothesis of Indeterminate Redemption and the Antinomian notion of the Divine Decrees. He holds to a modified form of Calvinism. The work is of great merit, and worthy of a high position in the literature of the subject.

——— **Mesurier** (Tho. le) The doctrines of Predestination and assurance examined in a Serm. pp. 67, 8vo. *Lond.*
A valuable sermon.

——— A ready reply to an Irish Enquiry, or a convincing and conclusive confutation of Calvinism .....being a wholesome theological Cathartic to purge the Church of the Predestinarian Pestilence. By a clergyman of the Ch. of England. (This is an ironical confutation).

——— **Cameron** (Chas. Rich.) The connection between the work of Man's Redemptionand the divine agents engaged in it. pp. vii., 30, 8vo. *Oxford.*
Also author of "Baptism accompanied by Conditional and unconditional grace," *Lond.*, 1849, 8vo.

——— **Evans** (John) General Redemption the only proper basis of General Beneficence. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Hopkins** (Ezekiel) Bishop of Derry, Works. 4 vols, 8vo. *Lond.*
Vol 2—Discourses concerning sin, original sin, &c.
Vol 4—A Sermon on Providence.
The 1st Discourses reprinted separately, *Lond.*, 1712, 8vo.

——— **Rees** (Abraham, *D.D.*) Practical Sermons. 4 vols, 8vo. *Lond.*
Vol 2, p. 346, on the Unequal Distributions of Providence.
Reprinted 1872.
The author was a Unitarian minister at the Old Jewry, Lond. Died 1825. He was the editor of Rees' Cyclopædia.

1810. **Savile** (David) A series of discourses on the peculiar doctrines of revelation. 8vo. *Edinb.*
The state of innocent and fallen man.
Another ed., 1814, 8vo. A minister of Edinburgh.

1810. Absolute Election and its dependent doctrines examined and disproved being a summary of Dr. Whitby's Discourse on the Five Points.
Caermarthen.

——— **Boufflers** (Marq. de) On Free-will. *Par.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Chase** (Sam.) Antinomianism Unmasked. 8vo.
Another ed. in 1819, *Lond.*, 8vo, with preface by Rev. Robt. Hall—"Many good thoughts, the preface by Robert Hall very striking."—*Bickersteth.*
This last edition only in the B. M.

——— **Fleming** (Alex.) Letter to a friend on the subjects of Liberty and Necessity. *Glasg.*
The author was minister at Neilston, Renfrewshire.

——— **Jervis** (Thomas) The Presiding Providence of God. A Sermon. 8vo.

——— **Lamont** (David, *D.D.*) Sermons on the most prevalent vices.
New ed. 3 vols, 8vo. *Lond.*
Vol 2, p. 169. Jacob and Esau, Romans IX., 13.
Vol 3, p. 129. Providence, Ps. 97, v. 2.

——— **More** (George) Sermons on the leading doctrines of the Gospel.
12mo. *Edinb.*
p. 1, Man's original uprightness. p 23, The disobedience of the first man. p. 248, Election. p. 327, Effectual calling.
The author was a Baptist minister in Edinb.

——— Blick in d. Geheimn. d. Rathschlusses Gottes über die Menschheit v. d. Schöpfg. bis Ende d. Welt. *Strassb.*

——— **Swedenborg** (Emanuel) The Wisdom of Angels concerning the Divine Providence. 8vo. *Lond.*
Many eds., others 1833, 8vo; 1868, 8vo; 1873, 18mo.

——— **Trail** (Robert) Works. 8vo.
In vol 2, The doctrines of grace are devotionally and practically displayed.
A Presbyterian Divine for many years pastor of a Scotch Congregation in Lond., d. 1716. Cecil refers to him as handling "the Sovereignty of God and such high points of doctrine with a holy and heavenly sweetness."

——— **Cormack** (John) An Inquiry into the Doctrine of Original Sin, with a critical dissertation on the words "All," "All men," "Many," etc.
12mo. *Edinb.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Fletcher** (John) A Poem entitled Grace and Nature, with notes. Transl. from the French by Miles Martindale. 8vo. *Leeds.*

——— **Tucker** (W.) Arminianism dissected. 12mo.
In answer to Brocas's "Calvinism Unmasked."

——— **Lovett** (Hen. Will.) Thoughts on the cause of Evil, Physical and Moral.
pp. 174. 8vo. *Lond.*
The book is scarce. It was written in the author's youth, but further consideration induced him to call in and suppress all the copies. The work is curious and original, but very unsound.—The author denies the fall of man and the existence of the devil. He looks upon evil as ordained by God in order that we may the better understand and enjoy its absence hereafter. He holds the doctrine of necessity and denies freewill.

[1810.] The Doctrine of Original Sin. Extracted [by J. Wesley] from a late author. 12mo. *Lond.*

1810. **Smyth** (Ed.) Confutation of Calvinism, being a Reply to Mr. Roby's late "Defence" of it. 12mo.

1811. **Tomline** (Geo., *D.D.*) A Refutation of Calvinism. 3rd ed. pp. 590.
8vo. *Lond.*
The author was Bp. of Lincoln and Dean of St. Paul's. He treats of the doctrines of Original Sin, Regeneration, Justification and Universal Redemption, & the peculiar tenets maintained by Calvin upon these points are proved to be contrary to Scripture, to the writings of the Fathers, and to the public formularies of the Ch. of England. The work went through several ed., a 7th appeared, *Lond.*, 1817, pp. 590, 8vo. It is a clear exposition of the weakest points of Calvinism, but hardly does justice to what Calvin and his followers actually taught.

——— [**Pott** (Jos. Holden)] Remarks on two particulars on a refutation of Calvinism, *etc.*, by a friend to the principle of that work. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Bellamy** (John) Ophion, or the Theology of the Serpent. 8vo. *Lond.*
Treats of the fall of Man. The author was a clergyman of the Ch. of Eng., but his views of the Trinity are most unsound.

——— **Pennington** (Montagu) Redemption, or a View of the Rise & Progress of the Christian Religion. 8vo. *Lond.*
An able work. The author was Vicar of Northbourne and Shoulden, and Perpetual Curate of St. George's Chapel, Deal.

——— **Ely** (Ezra Stiles, *D.D.*) Contrast between Calvinism and Hopkinsianism.
8vo. *New York.*
The author was of Philadelphia.

——— **Bidlake** (John) Bampton Lecture. 8vo. *Oxford.*
p. 35. Particular Providence. A 2nd edition, *Lond.*, 1813, 8vo.

——— **D'Oyly** (Geo., *D.D.*) Two discourses. 8vo. *Cambridge.*
One on the doctrine of a Particular Providence. A 2nd ed. 1812, 8vo.
The author was Rector of Buxted, 1815, and of Lambeth and Sundridge, Kent, 1820. Also author of "An Essay on the doctrine of Assurance."—*Lond.*, 1814, 8vo. 2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1817, 8vo.

——— **Pearson** (Ed., *D.D.*) Twelve Lectures on the subject of the prophecies relating to the Christian Church.
8vo. *Lond.*
One on "How far the foreknowledge of God is consistent with human freedom."

——— **Hyatt** (John) Sermons. 2nd ed.
8vo. *Lond.*
p. 263, Assurance. The author was a Calvinist Methodist preacher at Tottenham Court Road Chapel, and the Tabernacle, Lond. d. 1826.

1811. **Cecil** (Rich.) Works. 4 vols. 8vo.

Vol 4, Remains. The fallen nature of man and the need of grace. Other ed., *Lond.*, 1811, 8vo; 6th and 7th ed., *Buckingham* (printed), 1816 & 1821 12mo; Christian Library, vol 2, 1836, 8vo; *Lond.*, [1854], 8vo. The Remains also in the Christian Fireside Library, vol 14, [1852] 8vo; *Lond.*, 1876, 8vo, with preface by R. Bickersteth, Bp. of Ripon. The author was a native of London, Minister of St. John's, Bedford Row, 1780, and presented to the livings of Chobham and Bisley, in Surrey, 1800. He d. 1810, aged 62.

——— **Piggott** (Sol.) Sacred Truth. Pract. Lects. p. 418. 8vo. *Lond.*

2nd ed., 1818, A Lecture on man's first holy and happy state, his fall and the consequences, his misery and redemption, also prayers on these subjects. The author was Perpetual Curate of S. James's Ch., Latchford, Warrington, and Rector of Dunstable.

——— **Wright** (Rich.) Free Grace of God. pp. 245, 12mo. *Lond.* [*printed Liverpool.*]

Not in the Brit. Mus.

The work is an improved ed. of the author's "Antisatisfactionist."

——— **Burhans** (Dan.) The Scripture doctrine of the Election of Jacob and rejection of Esau considered. A serm. 8vo. *New Haven* [*U.S.*]

2nd ed., *Boston* [*U.S.*] 1828, pp. 31, 8vo.

1812. Scripture Doctrine of grace vindicated. 8vo.

In reply to Tomline's refutation.

——— **Wardlaw** (Ralph, *D.D.*) The doctrine of a particular providence. 2nd ed. 8vo. *Glasgow.*

3rd ed., *Glasgow*, 1819, 8vo. Also author of "Discourses on the nature and extent of the atonement," *Glasgow*, 1844, 8vo, which were replied to by a preacher of the Gospel [P. H. Waddell] *Glasgow*, 1844, 8vo. Dr. Wardlaw was the writer of "Lectures on Romans," 1869, 3 vols.

——— **Williams** (Ed., Dr.) Defence of Modern Calvinism. 8vo. *Lond.*

This celebrated defence by Dr. Williams may be fairly represented as the most able scientific exposition of Modern Calvinism.—*Eclectic Review*, 1836.

——— **Mant** (Rich., *D.D.*) An appeal to the Gospel. The Bampton Lecture, 1812. 8vo. *Oxford.*

Several ed., 6th, 1816, pp. 540, 8vo. Reviewed in *Quar. Rev.*, viii, 356—374, and xv, 475. The author was Bp. of Killaloe & Kilfenora, 1820; Down and Connor, 1823; and of Dromore, 1842. Sermon iii. is on "Calvinistic Predestination not the doctrine of the Gospel"; iv, "Calvinism inconsistent with the Divine attributes"; v, "The operations of the Holy Ghost neither irresistible nor perceptible"; and viii, "On assurance of eternal salvation." The work is too hard on Calvinists; Mant extracts the most extravagant statements of the most extreme among them, and attributes these views to Calvinists generally. See p. 111.

——— **Brocas** (Thos.) Calvinism unmasked. 12mo. *Shrewsbury.*

Not in the Brit. Mus. 2nd ed., pp. 220, 12mo. It is an answer to Tucker's "Predestination Calmly Considered" and "Arminianism Dissected."

——— The Fathers, the Reformers, and the Public Formularies of the Church of England in harmony with Calvin, & against the Bp. of Lincoln. By a Layman. 8vo. *Lond.*

1812. **Grant** (Johnson) Sermons. 8vo. *Lond.*

p. 174. On the origin and prevalence of evil. In a vol of Serm;, 1835, the author has one on "Original Sin," and "Particular Providence;" & in another vol, *Lond.*, 1843, 8vo, he has two on "Special providence." He was Rector of Binbrook, 1818, and Minister of Kentish Town Chapel, 1822.

——— **Gregory** (Olinthus G., *LL.D.*) Letters to a friend on the evidences, doctrines and duties of the Christian Religion. 2nd ed. 2 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*

Vol 2. Depravity of human nature—Providence. Another ed., 1815, 2 vols, 12mo. 9th ed 1851, 12mo; 1853, 18mo.

——— **Smyth** (Edw.) The doctrines of distinguishing grace examined. pp. 13. 12mo. *Lond.*

The author was a Wesleyan and wrote also "Paul against Calvin," "The Fall and Recovery of Man," a poem, *Belf.*, 1777, pp. 72, 12mo. "A Confutation of Calvin," *Lond.*, 1810, pp. 391, 12mo, and "Scripture and Calvinism at variance," *Manchester*, 1818, pp. 66, 12mo.

[1812]. **Wright** (Rich.) Calvinism and Arminianism refuted. 12mo. *Hull.*

Very rare.

He also wrote "A discourse on the Christian doctrine of the Atonement," *Wisbeach*, [1810] pp. 48, 12mo. see 1804.

1812. **Scott** (Thos.) Remarks on the Refutation of Calvinism by Tomline, Bp. of Lincoln. 2 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*

Vol 1 is dated 1811.

In collected works, *Lond.*, 1824, 8vo, vol 7. Able from the Calvinist's view. The reply on Original Sin is peculiarly good, that on Freewill not so strong, but in many points effective, there is however, nothing very original in the work.

——— **Schott** (Hen. Aug.) Comment. qua notio cognationis Dei hominumque in libro Genes. expressa indagatur. 8vo. *Jenæ.*

The author was Prof. of Divinity at Jena.

——— **Bennet** (Will.) The Legislative authority of Revealed Grace. 2nd ed. 12mo. *Lond.*

This is an Essay on the Gospel dispensation, considered in connection with God's moral government of man. The appendix contains strictures on the necessity of the Atonement and nature of regeneration. The author wrote in reply to some animadversions on this book "The Eclectic Reviewer examined." *Lond.*, 1813, pp. 104, 12mo. This reply, but not the original work, is in the B. M.

1813. **Brine** (John) A Treatise on various subjects, etc., revised by James Upton. 8vo. *Lond.*

The consequences of the fall and the assurance of faith are dealt with. The author was a Calvinist.

——— **Smith** (John Pye) Four Discourses on the Sacrifice and Priesthood of Jesus Christ, and on Atonement and Redemption. 8vo. *Lond.*

Other ed., *Lond.*, 1828, 8vo. [1834], 8vo. 1842, 12mo

1813. **Porter** (David) On divine decrees and moral necessity, reconciled with freedom of the Will, in opposition to fatalism and natural compulsion. A sermon. 8vo. *Nottingham.*

——— **Draper** (Hen., *D.D.*) Lectures on the Collects. 3 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*
Vol 2, p. 545, The God of Providence.

——— **Stevenson** (Robert) Power of Divine Grace. 8vo. *Lond.*
The author was a Dissenting minister.

——— **Birt** (John) Erastus and Trophismus—The conversations of, on the Doctrine of Distinguishing Grace. 12mo. *Hull.*
Printed at York. The author was a Baptist minister.

——— **Campbell** (John) An attempt to illustrate and defend the Scripture doctrine of human depravity, the Atonement, &c. 8vo. *Newcastle-upon-Tyne.*
The work was examined by Hails (W. A.) in his "Socinianism unscriptural," 1813, 8vo.

[1814]. **Davies** (Edw.) The Omnipotence of God. A Serm. 8vo. *Ipswich.*

1814. **Whitaker** (Tho. Dunham, *LL.D.*) A Sermon preached in the Par. Church of Lancaster, Aug. 25th, 1814. 4to. *Lond.* [*Leeds printed*].
The author was Vicar of Whalley, 1809, and of Blackburn, 1818, d. 1821.

——— **Buckminster** (Jos.) Sermons. (Grace.)

——— **Bell** (Thos.) View of Covenants of Works and Grace. pp. 498. 8vo. *Glasgow.*

——— The Predestined Thief, or a Dialogue between a Calvinistic preacher & a Thief condemned to the Gallows, translated from the Latin of Abp. Sancroft, by the Rev. *R. B. Nichols, LL.D.*, with an application to the recent case of Robert Kendall, who was executed at Northampton for robbing the Leeds Mail, Aug. 13, 1813. post 8vo. *Lond.*
See 1651.

——— **Venn** (John) Sermons. 3 vols, 8vo. *Lond.*
Vol 2, p. 31. Divine grace and human agency.
,, 3, p. 56. The nature of human corruption, and the inability of man (2 serm.)
The author was rector of Clapham, and died in 1813.

——— [**Krause** (J. F.)] Pr. de rationalismo ecclesiæ nostræ in doctrina de prædestinatione. 4to. *Konigsb.*

——— **Franke** (G. Sm.) De Historia dogmatum Arminianorum 8vo. *Kiel.*

——— **Aquila**, *pseud* [*i.e.*, S. Alexander] Serious Thoughts on the fall and restoration of man, with some remarks on the doctrines of predestination and original sin. 12mo. *London.* [*York, printed*].

1814. **Brocas** (Thos.) The beauties of divine truth. pp. xiv, 230. 12mo. *Lond.*
Intended as a refutation of Scott's remarks on Tomline.

——— **Warner** (Rich.) Divine Providence. A Sermon. 8vo. *Lond.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Mavor** (Wm.) The Fruits of Perseverance. Three Sermons. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Bruce** (John) The moral discipline of Divine Providence. A Serm. 8vo. *Dundee.*

——— **Duncalf** (John) Fatalism exposed and the Freedom of the will demonstrated. pp. viii, 335. 8vo. *Lond.*
Rare, the work is most valuable.

——— **Wright** (Thomas) A Familiar Conversation between a Calvinist and an Arminian.
Not in Brit. Mus.

1815. Simon Peter not a Calvinist. A Serm., by an aged Christian (C. B.) 12mo. *Exeter.*

——— **Sumner** (John Bird) Apostolic Preaching. 8vo. *Lond.*
Frequently reprinted: 2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1817; 3rd ed., 1818; 4th ed., 1820; 5th ed., 1824; 6th ed., 1826; 7th ed., 1832; 8th ed., 1839. *New York*, 1846, 12mo; 9th ed., *Lond.*, 1850, pp. 415, 8vo.
It is an excellent treatise, thoroughly practical and containing many sound and judicious observations on the subject of Predestination and Election. Dr. Sumner takes the view that the Election taught in Holy Scripture is not of individuals but of nations. It is not, however, a systematic work. See some adverse comments in *Gent. Mag.*, 1830, ii, 13. The author was Archbp. of Canterbury in 1848, and d. 1862. He also wrote a Treatise on the "Records of the Creation and on the Moral Attributes of the Creator," 1833, 2 vols, 8vo.

——— **Wette** (W. M. L. de) De Morte Jesus Christi Expiatoria comment. 4to. *Berolini.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Laurence** (Rich., *LL.D.*) The doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration contrasted with the Tenets of Calvin. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Probert** (Will.) Calvinism and Arminianism fairly stated. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Crawford** (Will., *D.D.*) Sermons. 8vo. *Edinb.*
p. 382, The Providence of God bringing good out of evil. The author was Chancellor of Straiton.

——— **Eveleigh** (John, *D.D.*) Sermons. 2 vols. 3rd ed. 8vo. *Oxford.*
Vol 2. The free will of man, and the similarity of the objections urged against it, from our ignorance concerning the foreknowledge of God, to those which are urged against the doctrine of the Trinity from ignorance in us concerning the divine essence. The author was Provost of Oriel Coll., Oxford, and Prebendary of Rochester. He was Bampton Lecturer in 1792. The Sermons were first pub. in 1792, 8vo, and the 2nd ed. in 1810, 8vo.

1815. **Witherspoon** (John, *D.D.*) Works. 9 vols 12mo. *Edinb.*
Vol 4, Man in his natural state. An ed. of his Works, *Philad.*, 1802, in 4 vols, 8vo, and his select works, *Lond.*, 1804, 2 vols, 8vo.

——— **Herce** (Jos.) M.S. De Divina gratia. In Spanish.
The author was a Jesuit. See De Backer, iv, 302–3.

——— **Wright** (Rich.) Essay on the Doctrine of Original Sin. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Duncan** (John) Philos. of Human Nature; Origin of Evil. 8vo. *Edin.*

——— **Chaplin** (Dan.) The dispensations of Divine Providence. A Serm. 8vo. *Cambridge* [*U.S.*]

1816. **Watson** (Thos.) Dissertations. 8vo. *Lond.*
The work was printed at Whitby, where the author was a Presbyterian minister.

——— **Fuller** (And.) Stricture of Sandemanianism. 12mo. *Nottingham.*
See 1757. In the author's collected works, *Lond.*, 1853, 8vo, will also be found, p. 234, "The reality and efficacy of divine grace, by Agnostos. p. 294, Dialogue between Crispus and Gaius [Free Agency of Man—Antinomianism—Depravity of man, &c.]; p. 309, Conversation between Peter, James, and John [particular Redemption]; p. 509, Mystery of Providence; p. 984, Fugitive pieces—Universal salvation—Mystery of Providence to different parts of the World—Election.

——— **Smith** (Thos. S.) Illustrations of the Divine Government. *Glasgow.*
2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1817, pp. 303, 8vo, containing a list of works relating to the subject. 4th Amer. ed., *New York*, 1857, 12mo. The author was a Universalist.

——— **Smedley** (Edw.) Prescience, or the Secret of Divination. A Poem. 12mo. *Lond.*
The author was Preb. of Lincoln, 1829, and d. 1837.

——— **Faber** (Geo. Stanley) Sermons. 2 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*
Vol 1, p. 405, The Predestination controversy; vol 2, p. 195, The stedfast faith of a Christian in the Fatherly providence of God.

——— **Cobbin** (Ingram) The French Preacher; or Sermons from the most eminent divines translated. 8vo. *Lond.*
p. 141, Providence—Bossuet. "Containing much biographical and historical information.... Mr. Horne considers Cobbin's notices of French sermons as very candid and correct."—*Bickersteth.*

——— **Caspart** (Ch. F. G.) De peccato s. malo morali. 4to. *Tubin.*
Not in Brit. Mus.

——— **Hare** (Edw.) A Caveat against Antinomianism. pp. 44. 12mo. *Leeds.*
A 2nd Caveat, *Leeds*, 1817, pp. 130, 12mo. The author was a Wesleyan.

——— **Ruter** (Martin, *D.D.*) Letter to Rev. F. Brown on Calvin and Calvinism. 8vo.
Also author of "Explanatory notes on the 9th Romans," and "Sketch of Calvin's Life and doctrine." He was a Methodist Superintendent of the Mission in Texas, 1837, d. 1838.

1817. **White** (William, *D.D.*) Comparative Views of the controversy between the Calvinists and Arminians. 2 vols. pp. xiii, 523, viii, 525. 8vo. *Philadelphia.*
The author was Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Pennsylvania, d. 1836. The work exhibits great research and is well worth perusal.

——— **Law** (Geo. Hen., *D.D.*, *Bishop of Chester*) A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Chester at the Visitation of that Diocese in 1817.

——— The Doctrines called Calvinism examined and compared with Holy Scripture. By a Layman. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Richmond** (Leigh) A selection from the writings of the Reformers. 8 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*
Vol 1, p. 590, Barnes (Rob.) A Treatise on Freewill. Vol 4, p. 673, Turner (W.) Of Freewill, &c.

——— **Bell** (Will., *D.D.*) Sermons. 2 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*
Vol 2, p. 415, The Providence of God; its nature and certainty. The author was Prebendary of Westminster.

——— **Cogan** (Tho.) Ethical questions; or speculations on the principal subjects of controversy in moral philosophy. 8vo. *Lond.*
p. 133, Philosophical Necessity; p. 341, On Moral obligation. The author was an English physician and divine, d. 1818.

——— **Mathew** (George) A series of Sermons. 2 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*
Vol 1, State of Man in consequence of the Fall and of Redemption. A 5th ed., 1834, 2 vols, 8vo. The author was Vicar of Greenwich, 1812.

——— **Hill** (Thos.) A Brief Vindication of Evangelical Arminianism. 12mo. pp. 36. *Preston.*

——— **Borger** (Elias Annes) Oratio de historiæ doctore, Providentiæ Divinæ administro. 4to.

——— **Fritzsche** (Ch. F.) Doctr. Ecclesiæ nostræ de prædest. a rationalismo alienissima et scripturæ S. convenientissima. 4to. *Leip.*

——— **Byron** (James M.) Antinomianism unmasked. 8vo. *Cheltenham.*
A Wesleyan minister of Ebenezer, Cheltenham, d. 1827. Replied to by Rees (J.) [1818], 8vo, "A Defence of Truth."

——— **Dace** (John) The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ manifested, and the Providence of God asserted in the experience of Mr. J. D. 12mo. pp. 27. *Walsall.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Scott** (T.) Remarks on Original Sin, Grace, &c.

——— **Brocas** (Thos.) Origin and Evil of Calvinism. 12mo. *Shrewsbury.*

——— **Dodd** (M.) A Serm. on the Doct. of Christian Assurance. 8vo. *Lond.*

1817. **Wilkinson** (Thos.) A Discourse on the doctrine of Original Sin. 8vo. *London.*

The author was Rector of Bulphan, Essex.

——— **Jamieson** (G.) An antidote against the poison of Antinomianism. 12mo.

Also same year, "Another blow at Antinomianism, and finishing stroke for Mr. John Briggs."

1818. **Burrell** (Jos. Franc.) The Will of God. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Colquhoun** (John, *D. D.*) A Treatise on the Covenant of Grace. 12mo. *Edinb.*

——— **Collyer** (Will. Bengo) Lectures on Scripture doctrines. 8vo. *Lond.*

p. 207, The Fall and its consequence; p. 286 Election; p. 491, Perseverance; p. 541, Providence.

——— **Mant** (Rich., *Bp. of Down, &c.*) The Sovereignty of God in the natural world, and the agency of man, practically considered. A Serm. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Krafft** (J. Ch. G. L.) De servo et libero arbitrio in doctr. Christ. de gratia et operationibus gratiæ accuratius definiendo diss. 8vo. *Nuremb.*

——— **Schulthess** (J.) Evang. Lehre von der freien Gnadenwahl. 8vo. *Zürich.*

——— **Beckwith** (James) A Serm. on Free Agency. pp. 24. 8vo. *Dunfermline.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.
The author was a Wesleyan, d. 1852.

——— **Macafee** (Daniel) Essay on the Primeval State and Fall of Man. pp. 120. 12mo. *Belfast.*

The author was a Wesleyan.

——— **Dwight** (Timothy) Theology explained and defended in a course of Sermons. 5 vols. 8vo. *Middletown Conn. U.S.*

Vol 1, Decrees of God and His Sovereignty—vol 2, Depravity of Man—vol 3, Perseverance. Many of these Sermons are surpassingly beautiful. Various eds. appeared, *Lond.*, 1819, 5 vols, 8vo; 1822, 5 vols, 8vo; 1823, 5 vols, 8vo; 1824, 5 vols, 18mo; 1826, 6 vols, 24mo; 1827, 5 vols, 18mo; *Glasgow*, 1831, 8vo; 1840, 5 vols, 18mo; 1 vol, imp. 8vo. American ed., *New York*, 1846, 4 vols, 8vo. The author's views were moderate Calvinism. He was for some years Pastor of the Congregational Church in Greenfield, Conn., U.S., and in 1795, became President of Yale College, d. 1815. On this work see Orme 162. It cannot be too highly spoken of.

——— **Wetherall** (John) Providence. 12mo.

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Curtis** (Jonathan) Divine agency of the Mind defended: and human freedom preserved. A Serm. 8vo. *Concord.*

——— **Fenwick** (A.) An Essay on Will.

[1818.] **White** (Geo.) A Discourse in refutation of the doctrine of Original Sin. 8vo. *York.*

1818. **Wright** (Rich.) Essay on Election and Reprobation. 12mo. *Liverpool.*

——— **Bruce** (Wm., *D.D.*) A Treatise on the Being and Attributes of God. pp. 224. 8vo. *Belfast.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.
p. 96, On Providence and the Origin of Evil.

——— **Browne** (John Hen.) On the Corruption of Human Nature. 8vo. *Nottingham.*

A charge by the Archdeacon of Ely.

——— **Davies** (Sam.) General Redemption (in Welsh). pp. 49, 8vo.

——— **Todd** (Hen. John) Original Sin, Freewill, Grace, Universal Redemption, etc., as maintained by our Reformers. pp. 244, 8vo. *Lond.*

Anti-Calvinist. A valuable and concise work.
The author was Vicar of Milton, 1792; Rector of Allhallows, Lombard St.; Keeper of the MSS. at Lambeth Palace, 1803; Rector of Settrington, Yorkshire, 1820; Preb. of York, 1830; Archdeacon of Cleveland, 1832, d. 1845.

——— **Scott** (Tho.) The Articles of the Synod of Dort. Transl. with notes. pp. 185, 8vo. *Lond.*

Other ed. by S. Miller, *Philadelphia*, 1841, 16mo: and 1856, 8vo.
The author was the well-known Rector of Aston Sandford, Bucks. In this work he has mistaken what was really a most highly-coloured one-sided account of the Synod of Dort and the proceedings thereof for an official and impartial account. It is valuable as containing a translation of the articles which, no doubt, have been much misrepresented by the Arminians. The decisions of the Synod were also translated into English by O. Jones, *Norwich* [1843], 8vo. Into French, *Leyden*, 1624, 3 tom, 4to.

——— [**Pott** (J. H.)] A Letter to a Friend, by the author of Remarks on two particulars of a Refutation of Calvinism. 8vo. *Lond.*

In vol 1 of the 3rd ed. of a Course of Sermons, *Lond.*, 1818, 2 vols, 8vo. This author has a Sermon on "The Temptation and Fall of Man."

——— [**Mathias** (B. W.)] A Ready Reply to an Irish Inquiry; or, a Confutation of Calvinism, *&c.* pp. 357, 8vo. *Lond.*

This is rather scarce. It is an ironical publication, really in favour of Calvinism.

——— **Beresford** (James) An Examination of the Doctrines of Calvin. A Sermon. To which is added the Doctrine of Necessity briefly considered. 8vo. *Leicester.*

Strictures on this Serm. by *Philos.*, *pseud.*, 1818, 8vo.

——— **Vaughan** (Edw. Tho.) The Calvinistic Clergy defended and the doctrines of Calvin maintained, in a letter to the Rev. J. Beresford. 8vo. *Lond.*

The author was Vicar of St. Martin and All Saints, Leicester, and Rector of Foston, Leicestershire. He also translated Luther on the Bondage of the Will, 1823, 8vo.

1819. **Jones** (John) A New Version of the 1st 3 chapters of Genesis. 8vo.
This work is said to be by Essenus. To it are affixed dissertations on the fall, and the principle of evil. The author was a Unitarian, and his work disclosed genius, but at the same time, as Mr. Orme says, "distressing perversity."

——— **Cooper** (Edward) Sermons. 6th ed., 2 vols.
Grace.
The author was Rector of Yoxhall, 1809, and d. 1833. "Plain, sound and useful."—*Bickersteth.*

——— **Kenny** (Dr. Arth. H.) Principles and Practices of Pretended Reformers in Church and State. *Lond.*
Anti-Calvinist.

——— **Laurence** (Rich., *LL.D.*) Authentic Documents relative to the Predestinarian Controversy. *Oxford.*

——— **Hamilton** (John L.) A Dissertation on the Scheme of Human Redemption. pp. 416, 8vo. *Oxford.*

——— Apeleutherus; or, An Effort to Attain Intellectual Freedom. pp. xvi., 235, 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Clapp** (John) Sermons. 3 vols, 2nd ed., 8vo. *Lond.*
Vol 1, p. 38, Fall of man. Vol 3, p. 241, Universality of Grace.

——— **Hooper** (J.) Serm. The best means of preventing the spread of Antinomianism. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Morgan** (Hector Davies) Bampton Lecture for 1819. 8vo. *Oxf.*
P. 87, the doctrines of the modern Calvinists compared with the Scriptures.
The author was Canon of Trallwug.

——— **Reid** (Thos.) Essay on the powers of the human mind. 3 vols, 8vo. *Edin.*
Vol 3, p. 316, on the liberty of moral agents.

——— **Godfrey** (Henry) The Grace of God that bringeth Salvation. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Mandell** (William) The Origin and End of a Christian calling. A Sermon. 8vo. *Camb.*

——— **Blomfield** (C. J.) A Sermon upon Predestination. 8vo. *Lond.*
Rare.
The author was successively Bp. of Chester and London.

1820. **Bowdler** (Thos.) Grace and Truth, the characteristics of the Gospel Dispensation. A Serm. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Bradley** (Chas.) Sermons. 2 vols, 8vo. *Lond.*
Vol 1, p. 163. The Throne of Grace.

——— **Barmann** (K.) Die Christl. Lehre der Vorsehung im Lichte des Geistes der Wahrh. erkannt u. philos. betrachtet. *Berl.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

1820. **Ammon** (Christoph. Friedrich von) Uber die Folgerichtigheit des evangelischen Lehrbegriffes von der sittlichen Unvollkommenheit des Menschen und seiner Erwählung zur Seligkeit. 8vo. *Hanov.*

——— **Bromley** (James) An Essay on Divine Prescience, &c. pp. 157, 8vo. *Lond.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Davies** (Sam.) Calvinism Unmasked. pp. 80, 8vo. *Carnarvon.*
The author was a Wesleyan, and the tract is in Welsh.

——— **Macafee** (Daniel) A Rational and Scriptural Investigation of the Doctrine of Original Sin, and the Foreknowledge of God. pp. 66, 8vo. *Belfast.*
Also author of Letters to Rev. J. Paul, on Imputed Sin, &c., *Belfast*, 1820.

——— **Sutcliffe** (Joseph) Sermons on Regeneration, comprising a general View of the Ruin and Recovery of Man. pp. 280, 8vo. *Lond.*

[1820]. **Fincher** (Joseph) Interpositions of Divine Providence. 12mo. *Lond.*

1820. **Parkinson** (Richard, *D.D.*) Sermons on Points of Doctrine and Rules of Duty. 2 vols, 12mo.
Again vol i., 1825, 1830: vol ii., 1832. Vol 2, The Fall of Man.
The author was of St. John's Coll., Camb., Canon of Manchester, Rural Dean and Princ. of St. Bees Coll., d. 1858.

——— **Stevenson** (Geo., *D.D.*) The Grace of God Illustrated. A Sermon. 12mo.
Also author of a dissertation on the Atonement. 2nd ed., *Edinb.*, 1817, 12mo.

——— **Drew** (Samuel) An Attempt to Demonstrate from Reason and Revelation, the necessary existence, essential perfections and superintending providence of an Eternal Being. 2 vols, 8vo. *St. Austell.*
The author was a shoemaker of Cornwall, a converted infidel, and became Editor of the Imperial Magazine. d. 1833.

——— **Petto** (R.) Great Mystery of the Covenant of Grace. New ed, 8vo.

——— **Scott** (Abraham) The Doctrine of Predestination. A Sermon. pp. 17, 8vo. *Newcastle-on-Tyne.*
Calvinistic.

[1820]. An attempt to delineate from Scripture the beginning progress and end of the work of grace in the soul of man. By a Clergyman. 12mo. *Norwich.*

1820. **Blair** (Adam) On the Covenant of Grace as made with Believers. A Serm. 12mo.

1820. **Forster** (John) A Treatise on the Free Grace of God.
2nd ed,, pp. ix., 374, 12mo. *Bolton.*
The author was minister of the Savoy, Strand.

——— **Carpenter** (Lant, *LL.D.*) An Examination of Abp. Magee's charges against Unitarians. 8vo. *Bristol.*
The author was a native of Kidderminster, father of Dr. W. B. Carpenter, the eminent physiologist. He was a Unitarian, ministering first at Exeter and then in Bristol.

——— **Garrow** (D. W., *D.D.*) Sermons. 8vo. *Lond.*
P. 23.—The Liberty of Christians.
P. 125 —The condition of man as a fallen, a redeemed, and an intellectual being.

——— Proclus Opera, e codd. MSS. Bibl. Reg. Paris, nunc primum edidit, lectionis varietate et commentariis illustravit Victor Cousin. 6 vols, 8vo. *Paris.*
Contains "De Providentia et Fato," and a treatise on the Nature of Evil. A Translation appeared in English by Thos. Taylor, *Lond.*, 1816, 2 vols, 4to; *Lond.*, 1833, 8vo, of which last only 250 copies were printed.

——— **Young** (Thos.) Three Sermons. pp. 298, 8vo. *York.*
One on original sin and another on Predestination. 2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1822.
The author was Rector of Gilling, near York, & he proves that Predestination, according to St. Paul, is different from that of Calvin. Dr. Graves refers to the above sermons as very instructive, and he considered that the synopsis of the argument of Paul's Epistle to the Romans, which is prefixed to them gives a more clear view of that important part of scripture than can perhaps be found in any work of a similar extent. As Dr. Graves had studied the subject deeply himself, his opinion is all the more valuable.

1821. **Sartorius** (E.) Die luth Lehre vom Unvermögen des freien Willens zur höheren Sittlichk. In Briefen. Nebst einem Anh. geg. Schleiermacher's Abhandl. (in der theol. Zeitschr. [s. ob. s. 16], Bd. 2), über die Lehre von der Erwählung. 8vo. *Gott.*

——— **Marheinecke** (Ph.) Ottomar, Gespräche üb. Augustins Lehre von der Freih. des Willens u. der göttlichen Gnade. Nebst Beilagen. 8vo. *Berl.*

——— **Wiggers** (G. Friedrich) Versuch einer Pragmatischen Darstellung des Augustinismus und Pelagianismus nach ihrer Geschichtlichen Entwickelung. 8vo. *Berl.*
This ed. not in the Brit. Mus., but another, *Hamb.*, 1833, 8vo, is. Transl. by Rev. Ralph Emerson. *Andover* [*U.S.*], pp. 383, 8vo.

——— **Scott** (Abraham) The Doctrines called Calvinistic, stated and illustrated. 2nd. ed., pp. 59, 8vo. *Hanley.*

——— ——— The Calvinistic Doctrines, exhibited and refuted. pp. 78, 8vo. *Newcastle-on-Tyne.*

1821. **Burnet** (John) An Essay on the Deity of Christ, viewed in connection with the Economy of Redemption. 16mo.
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Andrews** (Elisha) A Series of Letters upon this question: whether true saints are liable, finally, to fall from an estate of grace so as to perish everlastingly? 8vo. *Plattsburgh.*
A Reply to John Wesley's tract.

——— **Andros** (Thos.) Strictures on Rev. O. Thompson's review on his Essay on the doctrine of a positive divine efficiency exciting the will of man to sin, &c. 8vo. *Taunton* [*U.S.*]
To this Thompson replies in Brief remarks on the Stricture, &c., 12mo, *Providence.*

——— **Day** (Jeremiah) An Examination of President Edwards's Inquiry on the Freedom of the Will. 12mo.
The author was Presid. of Yale Coll.
Another ed., *New Haven* [*U.S.*], 1841, 12mo.

——— **Emmons** (Nathanael) A Sermon on the fore-knowledge of God. 8vo. *Middletown* [*U. S.*]

——— **Wilson** (R.) A Treatise on the Divine Sovereignty. 12mo.
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Chapman** (J.) A Short Sermon on the Original State, the Fall and the present state of the body and the soul. 5th ed., 8vo. *Tenterden.*

——— **Copleston** (Edw., *D.D.*) An Enquiry into the Doctrines of Necessity and Predestination, with an Appendix on the 17th Article. 8vo. *Lond.*
2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1821, pp. 219, 8vo. See Rev. in Quart. Rev., xxvi., 82.
The author was Provost of Oriel in 1814; Dean of Chester, 1826, and Bp. of Llandaff and Dean of St. Paul's, 1827.

——— **Barrow** (Will., *LL.D.*) Familiar Sermons. 3 vols, 8vo. *Lond.*
Vol 3, p. 375, Predestination; p. 399, Original Sin.

——— **Hough** (John, *D.D.*) Sermons and Charges. 8vo. *Oxford.*
The appendix to this work contains a scheme of the Arminian, Calvinistic and intermediate doctrines respecting God's decrees and human salvation: with observations on each system.
The author was Fellow of Magdalen, and was elected Pres. in 1687, in contempt of the Arbitary mandamus of James II., who illegally attempted to force the Fellows to elect Anthony Farmer head of the College. For an interesting account of the result, see life affixed to above book by Wm. Russell. Hough was Bp. of Worcester in 1717.

——— **Jones** (John) The moral tendency of divine revelation, Bampton Lecture for 1821. 8vo. *Oxford.*
Contains:—The fall and condition of man, and p. 393, the doctrine of Election and the Lambeth Articles.
The author was Rector of Llanbedr and Archdeacon of Merioneth.

1821. **Taylor** (Jos.) Remarkable Providences. 12mo. *Lond.*

The author was of the Royal Exchange Insurance Co., d. 1844, aged 82.

He gives some remarkable instances of miraculous preservation from premature death.

——— **Townsend** (Geo., *D.D.*) Sermons. 8vo. *Lond.*

P. 51.—The union of predestination and free will exemplified in Scripture.

P. 126.—The Greatness of God no argument against his providential government.

P. 143.—The fall, punishment and restoration of man.

The author was Chaplain to Bp. Barrington, 1822, and Canon of Durham, 1825. d. 1857.

1822. **Grinfield** (Edw. Will.) Vindicæ analogicæ, a letter to the Rev. Ed. Copleston, *D.D.*, on his Enquiry into the Doctrines of Necessity and Predestination. 8vo. *Lond.*

Also author of "Nature and Extent of the Christian Dispensation with reference to the Salvability of the Heathen," *Lond.*, 1827, 8vo.

——— **[Kaye** (John, *D.D.*)] A Letter to Ed. Copleston, *D.D.*, occasioned by his Enquiry into the Doctrines of Necessity and Predestination, by Philalethes Cantabrigiensis. 8vo.

See article in the *Quart. Rev.*, xxvi., 82—102.

The author was Regius Prof. of Divinity, Camb., 1816, Bp. of Bristol, 1820, and trans. to Lincoln, 1827.

——— **Copleston** (Edw.) Remarks upon the objections made [by Philalethes Cantabrigiensis] to certain passages in the Enquiry. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— Remarks on Copleston's answer to Kaye. *Lond.*

——— **Dalby** (W.) Defence of Copleston in answer to Grinfield. 8vo. *Oxford.*

——— **Pierce** (Sam. Eyles) The riches of divine grace unfolded and exemplified, eternal life, etc. 8vo. *Lond.*

The author was a Calvinist dissenter; minister of a congregation in Shoe Lane, Lond.

——— **Knight** (Will. Bruce) Considerations on the subject of Calvinism.

——— **Burrow** (E. J.) A Summary of Christian Faith and Practice. 3 vols, 12mo. *Lond.*

Vol 1, p. 94, Providence; p. 110, the Fall of Man and original sin; p. 139, the Covenant of Grace; vol 2, p. 44, Predestination, Election and Reprobation; p. 79, of Vocation; p. 338, Perseverance.

A very excellent and impartial work.

——— **Herbert** (Evan) The divine prescience considered in connection with moral agency. Sermon. 8vo. *Lond.*

The author was minister of Soho Chapel, Oxford Street.

——— **Hey** (Will.) Tracts and Essays, Moral and Theological. 8vo. *Lond.*

p. 475, Suggestions for reconciling the Arminians and Calvinists.

p. 520, On the doctrine of Final Perseverance.

"The observations of a clear and vigorous mind on various important topics."—*Bickersteth.*

The author was a Surgeon in Leeds. d. 1819.

1822. **Hill** (Brian) Twenty four Serm. 8vo. *Shrewsbury.*

p. 55, Concerning the nature of original sin; p. 113, The free grace and love of God; p. 187, God's operation in conjunction with the will of man.

The author was Chaplain to the Earl of Leven and Melville, and brother of the celebrated Rowland Hill.

——— **Lloyd** (Barth., *D.D.*) Discourses, chiefly doctrinal. 8vo. *Lond.*

p. 229, Doctrine of Predestination. The author was Prof. of Mathematics in, and subsequently Provost of the Univ. of Dublin. For account of him, see Dublin Univ. Mag., XI. 111—121.

——— **Metger** (Kr. H.) Das angeborne sittl. Verderben des Menschen, aus der Erfahr. u. aus der Bibel. *Nord.*

Another ed., *Emden*, 1830, 8vo.

——— **Burder** (Hen. Forster) The Scripture character of God, or discourses on the Divine Attributes. 8vo. *Lond.*

Author also of "The Sufficiency of the grace of Christ," a serm., *Lond.*, 1838, pp. 12, 12mo. "The Atonement of Christ," an address, *Lond.*, 1810, 8vo, and "The connexion between Divine grace and human endeavours," a sermon in the Brit. Preacher, vol 2, 1831, 8vo.

——— **Stonestreet** (Geo. S. G.) The Scriptural history of the fall of man compared with some of the ancient systems of the origin of evil. A serm. pp. 38. 8vo. *Newport.*

1823. **Holden** (Geo.) Dissertation on the fall of man. 8vo.

The author was a clergyman of the Ch. of England, and was evidently an able Hebrew Scholar.

——— **Maimbourg**, Histoire du Calvinisme et celle du Papisme, mises en parallèle. 4 vols. 12mo.

——— **Cottle** (Jos.) Strictures on the Plymouth Antinomians. 8vo. *Lond.*

2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1824, 8vo.

——— **Bishop** (Will.) Sermons. 12mo. *Oxf.*

p. 1, The disobedience and fall of man. p. 17, Redemption.

——— **Cunningham** (J. W.) Sermons. 3rd ed. 2 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*

Vol 2, A sermon on providence and the number of the redeemed.

——— **Werninck** (J., *D.D.*) 24 Sermons. translated from the works of French & Dutch Protestant ministers in Holland. 8vo. *Lond.*

p. 285, Providence, by Dr. E. A. Borger.

——— **Fawcett** (John) Sermons. 3rd ed. 2 vols. 12mo. *Lond.*

Vol. 2, p. 382. The vessels of wrath and the vessels of mercy.

The author was Rector of Scaleby.

——— **Hopfner** (E. F.) De discrimine mediatæ et immediatæ Dei efficaciæ rectius intelligendo diss. philos. 8vo. *Leip.*

——— **Haldane** (J. A.) Four Treatises: 1, Mystery of Redemption, &c. 12mo. *Lond.*

Also wrote on "The doctrine of the Atonement," 1845, 8vo. Another edition, 1847, 16mo.

1823. **Russell** (David) An essay on the Salvation of all dying in Infancy. 12mo. *Edinb.*

2nd and 3rd ed. same place, 1828, 12mo; 1840, 8vo; *Philad*, *U.S*, 12mo.

An independent minister at Dundee. A work of value and worthy of attentive consideration.

1824. **Biddulph** (Thos. T.) Divine Influence. 8vo. *Bristol.*

He also wrote a letter to the ed. of the Quarterly Review on animadversions on this work, pub., *Bristol*, 1825, 8vo.

——— **Brouwer** (Pieter vom Limburg) Disputatio. 4to. *Lug. Bat.*

Treats of Providence.

——— **Hamilton** (W.) A Dissertation intended to explain, establish and vindicate the doctrine of Election. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Birt** (Isaiah) The Moral Government of God. 8vo. *Lond.*

Against the Rev. Dr. Hawker.

——— **Nichols** (James) Calvinism and Arminianism compared. 2 vols. pp. 831. 8vo. *Lond.*

A work of elaborate research and abounding with the most curious information as to the opinions and history of those times.—*Lowndes.* Dr. Southey in his life of Bunyan, observes that it is a work of more research concerning the age of James and Charles I., than any other in our language.

——— **Skelton** (Phil.) Works, edited by R. Lynam. 6 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*

Vol. 3, p. 437, "Reflections on Predestination." The author in strength and precision has been ranked with Barrow and Sherlock, and in eloquence with Massilon and Bossuet. Skelton was Rector of Fintina, Ireland, 1766, d. 1787.

——— **Twopenny** (Rich.) Dissertations on some parts of the Old and New Testaments which have been supposed unsuitable to the Divine attributes. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Hobart** (John Hen., *D.D.*) Sermons on the principal events and truths of Redemption. 2 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*

The author was Bp. of the Prot. Episc. Church, New York, and his work is much esteemed.

———**Babb**(Jas.)The Reviewer reviewed, or an examination of the remarks in the Christian Observer of Nov. 1823, on "Cottle's Strictures on the Plymouth Antinomians." 8vo. *Lynne Regis.*

——— **Belsham** (Thos.) Extracts from the writings of eminent Divines of the Ch. of England, on the history of the creation and fall, etc., pp. v, 58. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Shepherd** (Lady Mary) Essay on the Relation of Cause and Effect. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Walker** (Sam.) Nine Sermons on the covenant of Grace. pp. viii. 141. 8vo. *Lond.*

Other ed., *Lond.*, 1839, 12mo; 1847, 12mo. The author was for many years curate of Truro, Cornwall.

1824. **Harrison** (J.) Sermon on the Supremacy and Free grace of God. *Kendal.*

——— **Hume** (David) An essay upon the relation of Cause and Effect. 8vo.

——— **Exall** (J.) Brief Calvinistic conclusions on the Moral Attributes of Deity. pp. 20. 8vo. *Tenterden.*

The author was a Baptist Minister.

——— **Mather** (James) Scripture doctrine of Election. 8vo. *Sheffield.*

——— **Gurney** (Jos. John) A Letter to a friend on... .....Christianity, and especially on the doctrine of Redemption. 3rd ed. pp. 70. 12mo. *Lond.*

15 editions published same year, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th, *Lond.*, 16mo, 12mo, and 16mo; 5th, 12mo; 11th *York*, 16mo; 15th *Bradford*, 12mo; 18th *London*, 1825, 12mo; 19th *Lond.*, 1825, 12mo; 20th [*Norwich printed*] 1825, 12mo; 22nd *Bradford*, 1830, 12mo; *Lond.*, 1855, 12mo. In French, *Paris*, 1832, 1838, and 1843, 12mo; *Londres*, 1851, 8vo. In German, *Lond.*, 1840, 12mo. In Spanish, *Londres*, [1870] 12mo. Mr. Gurney was a Quaker and wrote a work also on Redemption, *Lond.* [1830] 8vo.

——— **Macdonald** (Will.) Plain Serms. 12mo. *Lond.*

p. 35, The fall of man and his redemption (two sermons). The author was Archdeacon of Wilts.

——— **Marriott** (Geo.) A 3rd course of Parochial Sermons.

p. 191, On original sin. In the 2nd course will be found a sermon on "Final Perseverance."

——— **Middleton** (Thos. Fanshawe, *D.D.*) Sermons and charges. 8vo. *Lond.*

p. 43. National Providence. The author was Bp. of Calcutta, and d. 1822.

——— **Richardson** (Will.) Sermons. 2nd ed. 2 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*

Vol 1, p. 33, Sovereignty of God; p. 344, The vessels of wrath and vessels of mercy.

——— **Matthaei** (G. A. Rdf.) De orig. mali, præmissa placitorum præcipuorum apud vet. græcos philos. occurrentur brevi censura. 8vo. *Gott.*

——— **Milner** (Isaac) An Essay on human Liberty. pp. 130. 8vo. *Lond.*

The author was Dean of Carlisle, and President of Queen's Coll., Camb.

1825. **Scott** (Abraham) The Final Perseverance of Saints. pp. 84. 8vo. *Lond.*

This is a refutation of the arguments of Doctor Dwight and other Calvinists.

——— **Malkin** (William) Sermons, to which are added 3 Dissertations. 8vo. *Lond.*

One of the Dissertations is on Election.

——— **Priest** (J.) Wonders of Providence.

——— **Nichols** (James) The Works of Arminius. 3 vols. pp. 708, 754, 658. 8vo. *Lond.*

These works were also translated by Bagnall, (W. R.) 1853. 3 vols, 8vo.

1825. Agnostos. Thoughts on Antinomianism.
Not apparently in the B. M.

——— **Graves** (Rich., *D.D.*) Calvinistic Predestination repugnant to Scripture. 8vo. *Lond.*
A valuable and practical work. Another edit., *Dub.*, 1859, pp. 318, 8vo. See vol 3, p. 147, of his collected works, *Lond.*, 1840, 4 vols, 8vo. In the 4th vol, p. 528, will be found a Serm., "On national providences, or divine superintendence in national affairs maintained and exemplified." The author was dean of Armagh, 1813, and Regius Prof. of Divinity, Dublin. He d. 1829.

——— **Edwards** (Jonathan) President Edwards' doctrine of Original Sin. The doctrine of Physical depravity. 8vo.
This is a criticism of an article in the "Christian Spectator."

——— **Wiggers** (G. F.) De Jo. Cassiano Massiliensi, qui Semi-pelagianismi auctor vulgo perhibetur, 3 comment. 4to. *Rostochii.*
An Ed. in German, 1857, neither in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Hodson** (G.) Twelve Sermons. 12mo. *Lond.*
Two Serm. on the Fall of Man and his Restoration, and a third on Christian Assurance.

——— **Luscombe** (M. H. T., *LL.D.*) Sermons from the French. 8vo. *Lond.*
p. 277 Providence justified.—De Joux.

——— **Graf** (M.) Beyträge zur Keuntniss d. Geschichte d. Synode v. Dordrecht. 8vo. *Basel.*

——— **Scot** (David, *M.D.*) Discourses. 8vo. *Edinb.*
p. 95, The truth of a providence (5 serm.); p. 315, The Socinian, Arminian, Calvinistic, and Antinomian theories of Justification. Minister of Cortorphine, co. Edinb., Scotland.

——— **Wardlaw** (Ralph, *D.D.*) Man responsible for his belief. 12mo. *Glasgow.*
Two serm. on this subject in answer to Lord Brougham's Inaugural Discourse. 2nd ed., *Glasg.*, 1827, 12mo; *New York*, 1826, 8vo. In the Glasgow ed. are added two discourses on the responsibility of the heathen. The author was Prof. of Systematic Theology in the Independent Glasgow Theological Academy.

——— **Cree** (R.) Serm. on the government of God, by the Agency of Secondary causes. 12mo. *Liverpool.*

——— **Bridges** (Matthew) The testimony of Antiquity to the account given by Moses, of Paradise, and the Fall of Man. 8vo. *Lond.* [*printed Bristol*].

——— **Robinson** (Thos.) The Christian System unfolded in a course of Practical Essays. A new ed. 8vo. *Lond.*
p. 75, On the corruption of man's understanding; p. 82, On the depravity of the human will; p. 135, On salvation by grace alone; p. 185, On the Atonement. Sound and practical. The author held the living of St. Mary's, Leicester, and died 1813, aged 64. He is best known for his "Scripture Characters," *Lond.*, 1826, 8vo.

1826. **Close** (Francis) The Book of Genesis considered and illustrated. 8vo. *Lond.*
p. 24, The Fall of Man, 2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1828, 12mo; 3rd, *Lond.*, 1835, 12mo; 6th, *Lond.*, 1841, 12mo. In a series of Serm., the 5th ed. of which was pub. *Lond.*, 1835, 12mo, is one on "Redemption," and in the author's Miscellaneous Serm., *Lond.*, 1829, 8vo. P. 162, is one on "Sovereign Grace." The author was Dean of Carlisle.

[1826.] **Hoeven**: Two letters addressed to the Translator of the Works of Arminius. 4to.

1826. **Reynolds** (Edw.) Works. 6 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*
Vol 5, p. 319, Divine efficacy without human power. The author was Bp. of Norwich.

——— **Bowles** (Will. Lisle) Paulus Parochialis. 12mo. *Bath.*
p. 41, Predestination; p. 57, Particular Election.

——— **Giles** (W.) The Antinomian reclaimed.

——— **Waite** (Thos., *LL.D.*) Sermons on the 39 Articles. 8vo. *Lond.*
His object is to show that they are neither Calvinistic or Arminian, but scriptural.

——— **Hargreaves** (J.) The Doctrine of Eternal Reprobation disproved.

——— **Geffchen** (J.) Historia semi-pelagianismi antiquissima comment. inaugur. 4to. *Gott.*

——— **Beecher** (Lyman) The future punishment of Infants not a doctrine of Calvinists, etc. pp. 43. 8vo. *Boston.*

——— **Kirchenhoffer** (H.) The Book of Fate, formerly in the possession of Napoleon. From an ancient Egyptian MS. 11th ed. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Brown** (Thos.) A History of the Origin and Progress of the Doctrine of Universal Salvation. pp 416. 12mo. *Albany* (*U.S.*)
Not in the Brit. Mus.
Works on Universal Salvation not included in this list. See on this subject, Ballou (Hos.) Hist. of Universalism, *Boston*, 1829, pp. 326, 12mo; Whittemore (Thos.) *Boston*, 1830, pp. 458, 12mo. Another ed., 1860, 12mo; Grässe (Thos.) Bibliotheca Magica et pneumatica, *Leip.*, 1843, 8vo, and Algar, Hist. of Doct. of Future Life. Append. *Philad.*, 1864, 8vo.

1827. **D'Oyly** (Geo.) Sermons chiefly doctrinal. 8vo. *Lond.*
One on the particular providence of God; another on man's original corruption; and a third on the assurance of salvation.

——— An essay on the extent of human and divine agency in the production of saving faith. 12mo. *Edin.*

——— **Plumptree** (James) A popular Commentary on the Bible. 2 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*
Vol 1, p 85, The Fall of Man.

——— **Baumgarten-Crusus** (L. F. O.) De notionibus mediati et immediati in disciplina theol. 4to. *Jenæ.*
The author was Doctor and Prof. of Theology

at Jena, and author of a learned philosophical work, entitled "Progr. de Vero Scholasticorum Realium et Nominalium discrimine et sententiâ theologica," *Jenæ*, 1821, 4to. Neither this, nor the above work in the Brit. Mus.

1827. **Shuttleworth** (Philip Nicholas, *D.D.*) Sermons. 2 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*

Grace. Vol 1, 1827, 2nd ed., 1829; vol 2, 1834; 3rd ed. of both, 1840, 2 vols. The author was Rector of Foxley, Wilts., 1824; Warden of New Coll., 1822; and Bishop of Chichester, 1840. He died 1842.

——— **Shepherd** (Lady Mary) Essays on the Perception of an External Universe, and other subjects connected with the Doctrine of Causation. 12mo. *Lond.*

——— **Stevens** (Maria) Nature and Grace. 12mo. *Lond.* (*Thames Ditton printed.*)

——— A Dialogue on Providence, Faith, and Prayer. *Boston.*

——— **Atthill** (Lombe) The doctrine of Grace. 12mo. *Halesworth.*

——— **Battini** (Constantius) De mysteriis gratiæ divinæ, etc. 2 vols. 8vo. *Pisis.*

——— **Dillon** (Rich.) Popular premises examined in connexion with the origin of moral evil, and the attributes of God. An Essay. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Jarrom** (T.) Discourses on the 9th Romans. 12mo. *Wisbech.*

"Non-Calvinistic, but practical."—*Bickersteth.*

——— **Belsham** (Thos.) Discourses doctrinal and practical. 2 vols. pp. 486, 496. 8vo. *Lond.*

vol 2, pp. 61 and 201, The Providence of God; p. 84, Voluntary actions and their consequent events, foreknown and appointed by God; p. 111, Moral agency consistent with divine foreknowledge; pp. 145, The plan of providence; vol 1 was pub 1826. See 1807.

——— **Clay** (John) 25 Sermons. 12mo. *Lond.*

The fall of man and his restoration, 2 sermons. The author was Chaplain to the Preston House of Correction. His life by Clay (W. L.) entitled "The Prison Chaplain," *Cambridge*, 1861, 8vo.

1828. **Powell** (Thos.) Remarks on the Doctrine of Destiny as laid down by the Rev. S. Nichols. pp. 82. 8vo.

The author was a Wesleyan.

——— **Erskine** (Eben.) The Assurance of Faith opened and applied. 16mo. *Edinb.*

Other ed., *Edinb.*, 1843. 8vo; 1851, 18mo.

——— **Whateley** (Rich., *D.D.*, *Archbp. of Dublin*) Essays on some of the difficulties in the Writings of St. Paul. 8vo. *Lond.*

Essays 3 and 4, On Election, Perseverance, and Assurance. Sound and valuable. Treats of Election by analogy to the Election of Jews. A logical inquiry free from party spirit and evidencing a broad mind and sound judgment. The ground taken by Dr. Whateley is that the Election ascribed to God in Scripture which he admits to relate in most instances to an arbitrary, irrespective, unconditional decree, is not an Election to faith and salvation; but only to external privileges or means of grace, which men may improve or not as they choose. Various ed., 2nd, 1830, pp. 360, 8vo; 5th, *Lond.*, 1845, 8vo; 7th, 1864, 8vo.

1828. **Barrow** (Isaac) Discourse in vindication of the Christian Faith, and on the responsibility of man for his belief. 12mo. *Edinb.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Erskine** (Thos.) Unconditional Freeness of the Gospel. 12mo. *Edinb.*

Trans. into German, *Leipz.*, 1831, 8vo. The work occasioned considerable controversy.

——— Scripture inquiry into the state and condition of mankind, etc., with reflections on the moral government of God. 8vo. *Montrose.*

——— **Horbery** (Matthew, *D.D.*) Works. 2 vols. 8vo. *Oxf.*

Vol 1, p. 112, The doctrine of divine grace. He also wrote Animad. on Jackson's Christian Liberty asserted, etc., 1735. He was a Fell. of Magdalen Coll., and successively Vicar of Eccleshall; Canon of Lichfield, Vicar of Hanbury, and Rector of Standlake, see Gent. Mag., vols. XIX and XXVI.

——— **Braun** (G.) De S. Scriptura præscientiam et prædestinat. divin. atque libertat. human. sine repugnantia docente diss. theol. 8vo. *Mainz.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Jones** (James) An Enquiry into the popular notion of an infinite, unoriginated, and eternal Prescience. pp. 203. 12mo. *Lond.*

Suppressed by the Wesleyan Methodist Conference.

1829. **Dowling** (Edward) A treatise on Free Agency. pp. 228. 8vo. *Lond.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

No great loss, as the work is of no particular value. Part 2, in which the author attempts to prove that there is nothing in the Divine nature incompatible with the free agency of the intellectual world, is the best portion of the work.

——— **Crybbace** (Tho. Tully) An Essay on Moral Freedom. pp. 311. 8vo. *Edinb.*

This is an exceedingly silly work—the arguments are laboured and weak, and the vagueness of expression painful to a degree. The author is too favourable to Edwards, and may be termed an "inconsistent Calvinist." His liberty is servitude, and his freedom bondage.

——— **Graves** (Rich. H.) The Arguments for Predestination and Necessity contrasted with the Established principles of Philosophical Inquiry. 8vo. *Dublin.*

——— Predestination and Freewill, two Sermons by an Athanasian. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Crombie** (Alex.) Natural Theology, or Essays on the Existence of the Deity and of Providence, etc. 2 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*

1829. [**Jenks** (Francis)] A Reply to Three Letters of the Rev. Lynam Beecher, *D.D.*, against the Calvinistic doctrine of Infant damnation.
pp. 168. 12mo. *Boston (U. S.)*
See Christ. Exam. for 1828, full of information on this subject.

——— **Heber** (Reginald, *D.D.*) Sermons.
2nd ed. 8vo. *Lond.*
A serm. on God's dealings with Pharaoh, and on the Decrees of God. The author was Bp. of Calcutta.

——— **Short** (Thos. Vowles, *D.D.*) Sermons. 8vo. *Oxford.*
p. 281, Predestination; p. 329, Original Sin; p. 355, Final Perseverance and Redemption. "A valuable accession," *Christ. Rememb.* The author was Bp. of St. Asaph.

——— **Schmidt-Phiseldeck** (K. F. v.) Die Welt als automat u das Reich Gottes. Ein Beitrag zur Religious-phils.
8vo. *Copenh.*

——— **Jones** (James) Moral Freedom.
12mo. pp. 68. *Margate.*
A Wesleyan.

——— **Bacon** (R.) On Doctrines maintained by the Church of England, with observations on Predestination and Election. 8vo. *Lyme-Regis.*

——— **Allen** (George) The Moral Providence of God. A Serm.
8vo. *Worcester (U.S.)*
The author was pastor of the Congregational Church and Society in Shrewsbury, U.S.

——— **Gleig** (Geo. Rob.) Sermons.
12mo. *Lond.*
2nd ed., *Lond*, 1830, 12mo. p. 232, "The called according to God's purpose."

——— **Fox** (Will. Johnson) The Providence of God in the progress of Religious Liberty. A Sermon. 8vo.
Lond.

——— **Voigt** (J. G.) Comm. (præm. orn.) de Theoria Augustin. Pelagian. Semipelagian. et Synergistica in doctrina de peccato orig., gratia et libero arbitrio.
4to. *Goett.*

1830. **More** (Hannah) Works.
11 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*
Vol 9, On Providence.

——— **Russell** (Mich., *LL.D.*, *D.C.L.*) Discourses on the Millennium, the doctrine of Election, etc.
pp. 443. 12mo. *Edinb.*
p. 191—288 on Election.
The author was Dean of Edinb., 1831, and Bp. of Glasgow and Galloway, 1837. The above work, though without anything particularly original, is concise and valuable on the doctrine of Election. Dr. Russell adopts the Scheme of Locke.

——— **Sylvannus.** Thoughts on Antinomianism.
Not apparently in the British Mus.

1830. **Wardlaw** (Ralph) Two essays: 1 on the Assurance of Truth.
12mo. *Glasg.*
Other editions, *Lond.*, 1831, 12mo; *Edinb.*, 1832, 12mo; *New York*, 1830, 12mo; 1836, 8vo.

——— **Hamilton** (Wm.) Remarks on certain opinions recently propagated respecting Universal Redemption.
12mo. *Lond.*

——— **Hull** (Will.) Six Discourses.
8vo. *Lond.*
One on Christian Assurance.

——— **Daehne** (A. Fd.) De præscientiæ divinæ cum libertate humana concordia. 8vo. *Lips.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Erler** (J. C.) Commentatio exegetica de libertatis Christianæ notione in N. T. libris obvia. 4to. *Sorav.*

[1830.] **Waite** (Josiah K.) Calvinistic Views on the subject of infant damnation presented. pp. 4. 12mo.
[*Boston, U.S.*]
Not in the Brit. Mus.

1830. **Barrow** (Isaac, *D.D.*) Theological Works. 8 vols. 8vo. *Oxford.*
Vol 4, p. 1. The doctrine of universal redemption asserted and explained (4 Serm.) The author was the well known Mathematician and divine. Prof. of Greek, Camb., 1660. Professor of Geometry in Gresham Coll., 1662. Preb. of Salisbury, and Vice Chan. of Cambridge. 1st ed, of Theol. Works, *Oxford*, 1818, 6 vols, 8vo. Another editn. *Camb.*, 1859, 9 vols, 8vo.

——— **Fenn** (Jos.) Sermons.
8vo. *Lond.*
A serm. on the corruption of man. The same year was pub. a vol. of serm. by Warwell Fenn, *LL.B.*, *Colchester*, 8vo, which contains one on "The grace of Christ."

——— **Leighton** (Rob.) Whole works.
4 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*
Vol 4, p. 239, The decrees of God; p. 260, Providence. Other ed., *Lond.*, 1837, 8vo; *New York*, 1845, pp. 800, 8vo. The author was at one time Princ. of the Univ. of Edinb., and was Archbp. of Glasgow. He d. 1684, and is best known for his "Commentary on the 1st Epistle of Peter."

——— **Miller** (John) Sermons.
8vo. *Oxford.*
Two sermons on the original, fallen, and restored condition of man. Highly commended by Robt. Southey. The author was a Fellow of Worcester and Bampton Lecturer, 1817.

[1830]. **Leifchild** (John, *D.D.*) Obs. on Providence. 12mo.
The author was an independent minister of Craven Chapel, London.

1830. **Hinton** (John Howard) The work, of the Holy Spirit in Conversion considered in its relation to the condition of Man and Ways of God. 8vo. *Lond.*
Part II., chap. II.—Definition of Terms..... Power, Ability, Freedom or Liberty of Moral Agents. Chap. III.—Whether man in his natural state has power to repent. Chap. IV.—Whether power is imparted. Also in his Collected Works, 185—. The author takes the Augustinian view.

1830. **Newton** (Rich.) The Universal Redemption of Mankind the Doctrine of the New Testament. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Bonsall** (John Ouscley) Essay on the attribute of knowledge in God. 8vo. *Dublin.*

——— **Schmid** (Ch. Th.) De arbitrii hum. libertate non absoluta, tamen vera, philosophiæ et theol. arce P. I. 4to. *Stg.*

——— **Luc** (Jean André de) Examen de la Doctrine des Ecritures touchant..... ...la Rédemption et la Péché originel, etc. 8vo. *Genev.*

——— **Swan** (Chas.) The articles of the Church of England not Calvinistic. A serm. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Feldmann** (F.) Moira, od. üb. die göttl. Vorsehung für gebild. Verehrer der Relig. Jesu. 8vo. *Landsberg u. Züll.*

——— **Cheneviere** (J. J.) Du péché originel, ou de la dépravation héréditaire de l'homme. 8vo. *Genev.*

Another ed. same place, 1831. Not in the B. M.

——— **Dengler** (At.) Kann auch d. Philosoph das christl. Dogma de peccato orig. annehmbar finden? 8vo. *Landshut.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Ouseley** (Gideon) Calvinism: Arminianism. God's word and attributes in harmony. 8vo, pp. 52. *Dublin.*

2nd ed., *Dubl.*, 1831, 18mo, pp. 220. The author was a Wesleyan.

——— **Bond** (Robert) Strictures on Predestination vindicated. 8vo. pp. 98.

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Woods** (Leonard, *D.D.*) A Review of Dr. Wood's Letters to Dr. Taylor on the permission of Sin. 8vo. *New Haven.*

[1830.] **Wilks** (Washington) Fearless Defence of the leading Doctrines preached and received by modern Antinomians. 12mo.

Not in the Brit. Mus. Rare.

1830. **Martineau** (Harriet) Providence as manifested through Israel. 8vo. *Lond.*

2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1833, 8vo.

——— **Kennedy** (John) The Doct. of Universal Atonement vindicated. 12mo. *Paisley.*

The author advocates the Doctrine of Universal Atonement, but not of Universal Pardon.

——— **Haldane** (J. A.) Reply to Drummond's defence of Ed. Irving. 8vo. *Edin.*

(*Original sin*).

——— A brief delineation of characters; or, a few thoughts on the origin and evil nature of sin. By a Lover of Truth. pp. 15. 8vo. *Norwich.*

1831. **Ritchie** (David, *D.D.*) Lects. on the Romans. 2 vols, 8vo. *Lond. & Edinb.*

"Written with candour, moderation & talent." —*Brit. Critic*, Oct. 1835.

——— **Graham** (M. J.) Freeness and Sovereignty of God's Justifying and Electing Grace.

——— **Woodrow** (J.) The measure of divine providence towards men and nations. 8vo. *Glasgow.*

——— American Biblical Repository, April, being Vol I, p. 226.

Hist. of Arminianism.

——— **Rushton** (Will.) Defence of Particular Redemption. 12mo. *Lond.*

Printed at Liverpool.

——— **Dodsworth** (Will.) General Redemption and Limited Salvation. 8vo. *Lond.*

Formerly incumbent of Christ Ch., St. Pancras, and afterwards a Roman Catholic.

——— **Hawker** (Robert) Works, 10 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*

Vol 9. The true portrait of Antinomianism; being a letter to the Rev. James Bidlake. Hawker was a Calvinistic Divine, vicar of Charles-the-Martyr, Plymouth, for 50 years.

——— **Maltby** (Ed., *D.D., Bp. of Durham*) Sermons. 8vo. *Lond.*

p. 195. S. Paul does not favour the doctrines of personal election and reprobation, The call of the Gentiles, etc.

——— **Baltzer** (J. Bt.) Litterarum s. doctrina de conditione morali, in qua primi homines ante lapsum et post eundem vixerint Diss. dogmatica. 8vo. *Bresl.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

The author was Doctor and Prof. of Theology in Breslau, b. 1803.

——— **Lange** (J. P.) Die Lehre der heil. Schrift von der freien u. allgemeinen Gnade Gottes, dargestellt mit. Bezieh. auf d. Schrift v... a... Booth; der Thron der Gnade. 8vo. *Elberf.*

——— **Fish** (W.) Sermon on Predestination.

In the New York State Library.

——— **Burder** (Henry Forster) A Dis. on Election. 8vo.

In the British Preacher, vol 1. 2nd ed., pp. 35. *Lond.*, [1839], 12mo.

——— **Craps** (John) Election calmly considered. 8vo. *Lincoln.*

2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1836, pp. 274, 12mo. The author holds the Sublapsarian view, but as to reprobation agrees mainly with Drs. Williams and Payne. The work is practical rather than doctrinal.

1832. **Hampden** (Renn Dickson, *D.D.*) The Scholastic Philosophy considered in its relation to Christian Theology. 8vo. *Oxford.*

2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1837. 8vo. 3rd ed., 1848, 8vo.

Reviewed in British Critic, XIV, 125. This work caused much discussion at Oxford and elsewhere; for a list of the works relating thereto, see Allibone i, 781. Dr. Hampden was principal

of St. Mary's Hall, 1833. White's Prof. of Moral Philos., 1834. Regius Prof. of Divinity, 1836, and Bishop of Hereford, 1847.

The leading object of Dr. Hampden's work is to explain in what ways the philosophical and theological speculations of the Schoolmen have influenced the theological opinions of more modern times, and the language and phraseology in which these opinions have been commonly expressed. There is much of value in the volume, but at the same time the mode adopted by the writer is apt to lead the inexperienced into the error of imagining that the language in which the Catholic doctrine is embodied, and even the doctrines themselves can be traced to no higher source than the speculations of the Schoolmen.

1832. **Crisp** (Tobias, *D.D.*) Workes, notes by Dr. Gill. 2 vols, 8vo.

Contains A New Covenant of free grace; The two covenants; The assurance of Faith. The Author died 1642. He was a Calvinist, see account of him in Bogue's Hist. of Dissenters, and Allibone, i., 450. A 4th Ed. of Works, *Lond.*, 1791, 2 vols, 8vo. His Antinomian opinions called forth 52 opponents, see *Athen. Oxon.*

——— **Hincks** (John) Sermons. 8vo. *Lond.*

One on faith in Divine Providence.

The author was an Irish Unitarian minister.

——— **Hancock** (Will.) "Hear the Church." 10 Discourses. 3rd ed. 12mo. *Lond.*

p. 123, The 17th Article. 4th ed., *Lond.*, 1848, fcap. 8vo. The author was minister of St. Paul's, Kilburn.

——— **Kern** (F. H.) Comment. de Prædestinatione. 4to. *Tub.*

——— **Lundwall** (J. M.) Spec. acad. sistens prænotionem problematis, quo potuerit modo homo a deo desciscere, ipsamque problematis solutionem. 4to. *Helsingfors.*

——— **Muller** (Ju.) Lutheri de prædestinatione et libero arbitrio doctrina. Dissert. inaugural. 4to. *Gotting.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Parmeter** (J. D.) Village Lects. illustrating the creation and fall of man. 12mo. *Lond.*

——— **Drummond** (Will. Hamilton) Original Sin, an irrational and unscriptural fiction, dishonouring God, and demoralizing man. An essay. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Gooch** (Rich.) Redemption, and other poems. 12mo. *Lond.*

The author was of St. John's College, Cambridge.

——— **Wix** (Edward) The guilt of a denial of God's providence, a serm. pp. 23. 8vo. *St. John's.* [*Newfoundland.*]

——— **Cator** (Chas.) The Cholera Morbus, a visitation of Divine Providence, a serm. 2nd ed. 8vo. *Lond.*

3rd ed., *Lond.*, 1832, 8vo.

1832. **Young** (John) The Record of Providence, or the Government of God displayed. 12mo. *Lond.*

Another ed., same place, 12mo, 1844.

——— **West** (Francis Athon.) Divine providence or moral discipline, a serm.

The author was a Wesleyan.

1833. **Eberlin** (A. Ch.) De Gratia divina liberum arbitrium efficiente. 4to. *Heidel.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Hargreaves** (James) Essay on extent of the Divine Decrees. pp. 203. 8vo. *Lond.*

An exceptionally concise and valuable essay.

The author was evidently a clear thinker, and an impartial investigator.

——— **Lentzen** (J. H.) De pelagianorum doctrinæ principiis. 8vo. *Coloniæ.*

——— **Burns** (Jabez) The Doctrine of Scripture Election. A Serm. *Perth.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Fergus** (Hen.) The Testimony of Nature and Revelation to the Being, Perfection and Government of God. 8vo. *Edinb.*

"He has avowedly availed himself at times of Ray, Derham, and Paley, but his volume has many sources of illustration not known to those writers."—*Monthly Rev.*

It is a work of considerable research.

——— **Thom** (David, *D.D.*) The Assurance of Faith, or Calvinism identified with Universalism. 2 vols. 8vo. *Liverpool.*

The author was minister of the Scotch Church, Rodney Street, Liverpool, and subsequently of Bola Street Chapel, Liverpool.

He wrote also "The Scripture Doctrine of the Atonement," 1868, 8vo.

——— **Bretschneider** (Karl Gottlieb.) Die Grundlage des evangelischen Pietismus oder die Lehren von Adams Fall, der Erbsünde und dem Opfer Christi. pp. xii, 426. 8vo. *Leip.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Hawkins** (Edw., *D.D.*) Discourses. 8vo. *Oxford.*

The history of Providence, its use and value to Christians.

The author was Provost of Oriel, Preb. of Rochester and Ireland Prof.

——— **Scobell** (E.) Original Family Ser. 5 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*

One on "The Rest of Providence," in vol 2. In his Serm. on the Lord's Prayer, *Lond.*, 1815, 8vo, p. 141, is one on Providence, and p. 224, on Evil in general.

——— **Vaughan** (Hen.) Serm. 8vo. *Lond.*

p. 202, Rom. viii, 30. The external and internal call —p. 216, Assurance.

——— **Harris** (Geo.) The Harmony of Nature, Providence, and Christianity. A Disc. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Turner** (Geo.) Eternal Election and Reprobation inseparable. pp. 64. 8vo. *Lond.*

1834. **Barnes** (Jos.) The Assurance of Salvation by faith. A Serm. 8vo. *Berwick.*
The author was Vicar of Berwick.

——— **Smith** (Hugh, *D.D.*) The heart delineated in its state of nature and as renewed by Grace. 18mo. *New York.*
The author was a divine of the Prot. Episcopal Church, America.

——— **Rennie** (James) Alphabet of Natural Theology. 12mo. *Lond.*
P. 92, The Attributes of God, p. 109, Of the Origin of Evil.

——— **Jones** (Jos.) Human Responsibility plainly and practically considered, with remarks on Calvinism and Arminianism. 8vo. *Oxford.*

——— **Clarke** (Dr. Adam) Discourse on subjects relative to the Being and Attributes of God and His Works in Creation, Providence, and Grace. 3 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*
The 1st ed. seems to have been 1828—30. Another ed., *Lond.*, 1868, 4 vols, 12mo.

——— **King** (Archp.) Discourse on Predestination. 8vo. *Lond.*
See ante p. 135. This ed. is by way of appendix to Whateley's "Use and Abuse of Party Feeling in matters of religion."

——— **Youngman** (Will.) The capacities and responsibilities of man in relation to the moral government of God examined. 8vo. *Norwich.*

——— **Croly** (Geo., *LL.D.*) Divine Providence; or the Three Cycles of Revelation. 8vo. *Lond.*
The author was Rector of St. Stephen's, Walbrook. He was a most voluminous writer. "To Dr. Croly belongs the high and lasting praise of lending new force to the defenders of religion, and adding a new wing to the temple of the Christian faith."—*Gent.Mag.* The work is rather too imaginative, and in parts somewhat unsound.

——— **Anderson** (M.) Ten Discourses. 12mo. *Lond.*
p. 94, Exod. xii, 26, 27. Pharaoh's heart hardened.

——— **Arnold** (Thos.) Sermons. 8vo. *Lond.*
Vol 3, p. 56, Christian redemption.

——— [**Teignmouth** (Lord)] Thoughts on the Providence of God. 18mo. *Lond.*

——— **Watson** (Rich.) Works. 2nd ed. 12 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*
Vol 7, Reviews, Copleston on Predestination. Watson was a Wesleyan minister.

——— **Edwards** (Jonathan) God's Sovereignty in the Salvation of men. A Serm.
In vol 2, of Works, p. 849.

——— **Moorhouse** (W.) Arminianism and Calvinism compared in their principles, tendencies, and results. 8vo. *Lond.*

1834. **Dixon** (Myles C.) Strictures on a pamphlet entitled "The Doctrine of Predestination," being a reply to Rev. Mr. Price. pp. 12. 12mo. *Barnard Castle.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.
Dixon was also author of "Strictures confirmed," same year and place, pp. 28, 12mo. He was a Wesleyan.

——— **Philip** (Rob., *D.D.*) Redemption, or the New Song in Heaven. 18mo.
Other ed., 1838, 18mo; 1872, 8vo. The author was a Dissenter.

——— **Baker** (Thos. Bagnall) The Old Adage of "The Elect shall be saved so they may do as they will and live as they please," scripturally considered. 2nd ed. 12mo. *Lond.*

——— ——— A Lay member's letter on the Dogmas of Calvinism answered. 12mo. *Lond.*

——— **Brandam** (Andrew) Thoughts on the Providence of God. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Hewlett** (A.) A word of reproof to the unknown author of "A letter on the dogmas of Calvinism." 8vo.

1835. **Cooke** (W.) The extent of the claims of the law of Moses developed; and the doctrines of Election and Justification examined. 8vo. *Lond.*
These are conversations between a minister of the Ch. of Eng., and a Jew.

——— **Calder** (Frederick) Memoirs of Simon Episcopius: to which is added a brief account of the Synod of Dort. 8vo. pp. 549. *Lond.*

——— **Bockshammer** (Gustav. Ferdinand) On the freedom of the human will. Trans. from the German by A. Kaufman, jun. pp. xii, 187, 12mo. *Andover.* (*Massachusetts*).

[1835.] **Roberts** (Wm.) On the Grace of Election.
The author was b. in 1809, and was Pastor of the Welsh Calvinistic Methodist Ch., Allen St., New York.

1835. **Butler** (Piers Edm.) The rationality of revealed religion. 12mo. *Ipsw.*
p. 126, Divine Predestination considered in connection with human accountability. The author was Curate of St. Margaret's, Ipswich.

——— **Mountain** (Jacob Henry Brooks, *D.D.*) 21 Sermons. 12mo. *Lond.*
p. 258, The origin of evil.
The author was Preb. of Lincoln, and Rector of Blunham, Bedfordshire.

——— **Newman** (John Henry) Parochial Sermons. 6 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*
Vol 2, A serm. on Divine decrees.
Vol 3, A Particular Providence as revealed in the Gospel.

Vol 5, Many called, few chosen.
Vol 5, The Power of the Will.

In his sermons before the University of Oxf., *Lond.*, 1843, 8vo, is one on Justice as a principle of divine government, and another on human responsibility.

1835. **Smith** (Gilbert N.) The fundamental doctrines of calling, election, and present salvation, together with the possibility of losing or securing these privileges, scripturally stated and considered. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Passavant** (J. K.) Der Freiheit des Willens und dem Entwickelungsgesetze des Menschen. 8vo. *Frankf.*

——— The providence of God illustrated.

——— **Alford** (Henry) Divine Love; or, Creation and Redemption. 12mo.

——— **Brown** (Thos., *M.D.*) Inquiry into the Relation of Cause and Effect. 8vo.

——— **Wilson** (W., *D.D.*) The Attributes of God. 8vo. *Lond.*

Printed Thames Ditton. The author was Rector of Church Oakley, Hants., afterwards Vicar of Holy Rood, Southampton, and Rural Dean and then Preb. of Winchester.

1836. **Beecher** (Lyman) Views in Theology. 2nd ed. 12mo. *Cincinnati.*

Replied to by Harvey, 1837, who alleges that Beecher's views to be Pelagian as to moral agency.

——— **Payne** (Geo., *D.D.*, *LL.D.*) Lectures on Divine Sovereignty, Election, &c. pp. 403. 8vo. *Lond.*

2nd ed., 1838; 3rd ed., *Lond.*, 1846, 8vo. The author was Prof. of Divinity in the Western (Congregational) Coll. The work is of great merit. It contains many original ideas, and brings out with great force a modified form of Calvinism—Calvinism denuded of many of its harsh and forbidding features. Will repay perusal.

——— **Holloway** (Jas. Thos., *D.D.*) The Analogy of Faith, or an attempt to shew God's method of Grace with his Church, as set forth in the experience of David. 8vo. *Lond.*

"Valuable Discourses," *Christian Rembr.* The author was Minister of Fitzroy Chapel, Lond.

——— **Faber** (Geo. Stanley) The Primitive Doctrine of Election. 8vo. *Lond.*

2nd ed, *Lond.*, 1842, pp. 448, 8vo. "A laborious and learned work."—*British Critic.* "Mr. Faber verifies his opinions by demonstration. We cannot pay it higher respect than by recommending it to all."—*Church of Eng. Quar. Rev*, see ante p. 111. A most judicious treatise. It is concise and sound, the best of all this well known author's works, and probably the best book on the subject adopting the true scriptural and church view.

——— **McCrie** (Thos., *D.D.*) Sermons. 8vo. *Edinb.*

p. 268, Assurance. The author was Prof. of Divinity at Whitburn.

1836. **Oram** (William) Discourses on the grand subjects of the gospel. 12mo. *Lond.*

p. 47, Mystery of Providence; p. 83, Redemption.

——— **Benson** (John) The Revival and Rejection of an old traditional heresy as handed down by Calvin, etc., or the doctrine of God's decreeing all sin examined and refuted. pp. 280. 12mo. *Manchester.*

The above is now a scarce work. It is ably written, scriptural, logical and fair. The author was of Ardwick, Manchester.

——— **Gilbert** (Jos.) The Christian Atonement...as applied to the Redemption of Man. 8vo.

2nd ed., 1852, 8vo.

——— Redemption and Reconciliation through Christ. A Tract.

[1836.] **Dow** (Lorenzo) Reflections on the love of God, on predestination, etc. 12mo. *Bemersley.*

1837. **Harvey** (J.) An examination of the Pelagian and Arminian theory of moral agency in "Views in theology." 12mo.

——— **Hooper** (John) The Ecclesia, or the called. 12mo. *Lond.*

2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1845, 12mo. Sound catholic doctrine. The author was the prophetic Rector of Albury.

——— **Chapman** (Daniel) A Discourse on the complete Restoration of Man, morally and physically considered. pp. 418. 8vo. *Leeds.*

——— **Thurling.** Things of Time.

p. 339, Providence.

——— **Erskine** (Thos.) The doctrine of Election. pp. 572. 8vo. *Lond.*

Contains many brilliant thoughts and effective observations. The author arrived at the conclusion that the doctrine of Election as taught in the Bible is altogether different and opposed to that which has passed under the name and been received as true by a great part of the professing Church through many ages.

——— **Chalmers** (Thos., *D.D.*, *LL.D.*) Five Lectures on Predestination. 2nd ed. 8vo. *Lond.*

His collected works were published in Glasgow without date, in 25 vols, 12mo. In vol 2 is "Leibnitz's theory of the origin of evil and the doctrine of a special providence." In vol 9 a sermon on the Doctrine of Predestination. The author was the greatest Scotch divine of his day, and of course a thorough Calvinist. He occupied for some years the chair of theology in the Univ. of Edinburgh. In his "Prelections on Butler's Analogy," he certainly made Calvinism appear in its most attractive features. His works are most eloquent, and are highly prized by many.

——— **Anderson** (James S. M.) Sermons. 8vo. *Lond.*

p. 29, Phil. ii, 12, 13, The Grace of God and the agency of man.

1837. **MacCulloch** (John, *M.D.*) Proofs and illustrations of the attributes of God, from the facts and laws of the physical universe. 3 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*
3rd, best ed., 1843, 3 vols, 8vo.

——— **Fowle** (Fulwar Will.) The corruption of human nature, etc. A Serm. 8vo. *Salisbury.*

——— **Whyte** (Alex.) The Heritage of God's people, being a practical dissertation on Divine Providence. 8vo. *Edin.*
Another ed., 1839, 4to. An able work.

——— **Redford** (Geo., *D.D.*, *LL.D.*) Holy Scripture verified. 8vo. *Lond.*
The condition of human nature under the fall.

——— **Jenkyn** (Thos. W.) The extent of the Atonement. 12mo.
3rd ed., *Lond.*, 1842, 8vo.

——— **Philipponi** (P.) Tractatus de Gratia reparationis. 8vo. *Panormi.*

——— **Turner** (Will.) Thoughts on the doctrine of original sin.

——— **Babbage** (Chas.) The 9th Bridgewater Treatise. A Fragment. 8vo. *Lond.*
Chap. 3, "Argument against fate; 15 Reflexions on Freewill," 2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1838, 8vo.

——— **Badger** (Albert) Universal Redemption the doctrine of the Bible, and of the Prayer Book of the Ch. of England. Two Serm. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Nelson** (Robt. J.) An Essay on Man's Moral Agency. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Savery** (Christ.) On the original Election of the Church. 12mo. *Plymouth.*

1838. **Riddle** (J. E.) Sermons, doctrinal and practical. 8vo. *Lond.*
p. 1, Works and grace; p. 33, Man's ruin and the blessing of redemption.

——— **Hopkins** (Benj.) Sermons. 8vo. *Lond.*
One on "The original state of man." A 2nd ed. same year and place, 3rd ed., 1841. The author was Curate of Keyworth, Notts., Perpetual Curate of Barbon, Westmoreland.

——— **Miller** (John) Sermons. 8vo. *Lond.*
p. 45, God's sovereign grace and man's responsibility; p. 67, The special providence of God; p. 437, The doctrine of free grace. The author was Rector of St. Martin's, Birmingham, and Hon. Canon of Worcester.

——— The Lord Bishop of Ripon's cobwebs to catch Calvinists. By a clergyman of the diocese.

——— **Thom** (David) Dialogues on Universal Salvation and topics connected therewith. 8vo. *Liverpool.*
"A brief sketch of the plan of salvation, or God's way of bringing a sinner to heaven in its origin, its tendency, its design, and its influence, as an exposition of Rom. viii, 29-30, or of the 17th Article, not as a matter of controversy, but of devotion and practical influence is a desideratum in English literature."—*Bickersteth.*

1833. **Butt** (Thos.) Sermons. 8vo. *Lond.*
One on the free grace of God. The author was Rector of Kinnersley and Curate of Trentham.

——— **Gisborne** (Thos.) An enquiry respecting love as one of the Divine attributes. 8vo. *Lond.*
Grace—the Fall—Redemption. The author was Perpetual Curate of Barton-under-Needwood, in Staffordshire, 1783, and Preb. of Durham, 1826. See *Gent. Mag.*, June 1846.

——— **Griffith** (Thos.) Sermons. 2nd ed. 12mo. *Lond.*
A Serm. on Providence. The author was Minister of Ram's Chapel, Homerton.

——— **Haverfield** (Thos. Tunstall) Sermons. 2 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*
Vol 2, Original sin. The author was Rector of Goddington, Oxfordshire, and minister of York St. Chapel, St. James's, Westminster.

——— **Mathias** (B. W.) 21 Sermons chiefly preached in Bethesda Chapel, Dublin. 8vo. *Dublin.*
Two serm. on the Grace of God.

——— **Moberly** (Geo.) Practical Sermons. 8vo. *Lond.*
p. 221, Original sin. The author was Bishop of Salisbury.

——— **Cudworth** (Ralph, *D.D.*) Treatise on Freewill. 8vo. *Lond.*
The writer was the author of the celebrated "True intellectual System." There are also MSS. of Cudworth on "Moral Good and Evil," and "Liberty and Necessity," each of which are about 1000 pages, fol. The author was Master of Clare Hall, 1664; Prof. of Hebrew, 1645; Master of Christ's Coll., 1654; Vicar of Ashwell, Hertfordshire, 1662, and Preb. of Gloucester, 1678.

——— **Van Mildert** (William, *Bishop of Durham*) Theological Works. 6 vols. 8vo. *Oxf.*
Vol 5, p. 143, Man's primeval and fallen state. vol 6, p. 241, St. Paul's application of the History of Jacob and Esau.
This work is not apparently in the B. M.

——— **Krummacher** (F. W.) On Free Grace. 18mo.

——— **Erler** (J. C.) De Justitia divina diss. apologetica. 8vo. *Halæ.*

——— **Schumacher** (J. Jos. H.) Ueber Erbsünde und Erbschuld; nach d. Lehrbestimmungen d. Kirche. 12mo. *Köln.*

——— **Franenstadt** (J.) Die Freiheit des Menschen u. die Persönlichkeit Gottes. 8vo. *Berl.*

——— **Douglas** (Geo.) Divine Conduct; or the Mystery of Providence illustrated by Anecdotes.
3rd ed. 24mo. pp. 200. *South Shields.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.
The author was a Wesleyan who d. in 1853.

——— **Macafee** (Daniel) The final perseverance of the Saints anatomized. 8vo. pp. 80. *Cork.*

1838. **Meek** (Emma) Thoughts on the Responsibility of Man. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Wayland** (Francis, *D.D., LL.D.*) The limitations of human responsibility. 12mo. *Boston* [*U.S.*]

Another ed., *Lond.*, 1838, 8vo, rev. in Eclec. Rev., 4th Ser. vii, 685, Lit. and Theol. Rev., v, 533 and vi, 23, 151, Christ. Exam., xxiv, 277. *New York*, 1838, 12mo. The author was one of the most eminent of American divines and philosophers, Prof. of Mathematics, and Natural Phil. in Union Coll., 1826, Pres. of Brown Univ. He wrote on "The moral efficacy of the Doctrine of the Atonement," a serm., *Boston* (*U. S.*), 1831, 8vo.

——— A Young Man's account of his conversion from Calvinism. *Boston.*

——— **Day** (Jer.) An inquiry respecting the self-determining power of the will; or contingent volition. 12mo. *New Haven* (*U.S.*)

The author was President of Yale College.

——— **Cassels** (Samuel) Providence and other poems. 8vo. *Macon.*

——— **Tyler** (B.) A Review of President Day's Treatise on the Will. 8vo.

Tyler also wrote on the "Doctrine of Perseverance of the Saints," 18mo, in which volume is Spring (Gardiner, *D.D., LL.D.*) "Doctrine of Election."

——— **Wells** (James) Reprobation and Election. A Serm. 12mo. *Lond.*

The author was minister of the Surrey Tabernacle.

[1838.] **Cox** (Francis Augustus) *D.D., LL.D.*) The Scriptural account of human apostacy confirmed, &c. 8vo.

Also author of "The nature and design of moral government," [1840], 8vo.

1839. **Norton** (Rob., *M.D.*) Neglected and Controverted Scripture Truths. pp. 444. 8vo. *Lond.*

p. 51, The permission of evil, and the nature of the Fall; p. 116, Unconditional freeness of salvation by Grace; p. 140, Election; p. 164, Final Perseverance.

——— **Davies** (Sam.) Commentary on Rom. IX. pp. 404. 8vo. *Llanidloes.*

Written in Welsh, and not apparently in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Brake** (Chas.) Election, a doctrine clearly revealed in the Scriptures. A Serm. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Tappan** (Hen. P., *D.D., LL.D.*) Review of Edwards on the Will. 8vo. *New York.*

The author was Prof. of Intellectual and Moral Philosophy in the University of the City of New York, and Chancellor of the State University of Michigan. The above is an able exposition of the Fallacies of Edwards– in fact, the most thorough we have met with. Another ed., 1857, 8vo.

——— **Boardman** (Hen. A., *D.D.*) The Scripture doctrine of Original Sin. pp. 120.

Not in the Brit. Mus.
The author was a Presbyterian of Philadelphia. He published some discourses on Election, and also one on "God's providence in accidents," *Philadelphia*, 1855, 8vo.

[1839.] What is an Egg worth? or the Blessings of Providence. 16mo. *Lond.*

1839. **Buckland** (Will.) An Inquiry whether the sentence of death pronounced at the Fall included the whole animal creation. A Serm. 8vo. *Lond.*

2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1839, pp. vi, 31. The author was Dean of Westminster.

——— **Cooper** (Robt.) A Lecture on Original Sin. 4th ed. 12mo. *Manchester.*

The author was a Secularist.

——— **Wells** (Jas.) Predestination relative to.....the Book of Life. A Serm. 12mo. *Lond.*

——— **Brougham** (Hen. Lord) Dissertations on subjects of Science connected with Natural Theology. 8vo. *Lond.*

Contains a Diss. on the origin of evil.

——— **Binning** (Hugh) Works, by Jas. Cochrane. 3 vols. 12mo. *Edinb.*

Vol 1, p. 155. The Decrees of God.—p. 212. God's works of providence.—p. 219. God's providence towards men.—p. 241. The evil of Adam's first sin. There had been a previous edition of the works, *Edinb.*, 1735, 4to; and was another subsequently, *Edinb.*, 1847, 8vo.

——— **Harte** (Will. Marshall) Practical Sermons. 12mo. *Lond.*

p. 305. The providence of God. The author was examining chaplain to Dr. Coleridge, Bp. of Barbadoes; and Rector of St. Lucy.

——— **Singer** (J. H.) Serm. on the origin of evil. 8vo. *Dublin.*

In Irish Pulpit, 3rd series, 2nd ed.

——— **Pleyte** (D. C.) Præcipua placita veterum philosophorum de libertate morali. 8vo. *Traj.*

——— **Howorth** (Will.) Sermons. 12mo. *Lond.*

p. 112, Rom. ix, 20—21. Election and Reprobation.

——— **Muller** (Julius) Die christliche Lehre von der Sünde. 8vo. *Breslau*

Other ed., same place, 1849, 2 vols, 8vo; *Stutt.*, 1877, 2 vols. Trans. into English by W. Pulsford, *Edinb.*, 1846, 1852, 2 vols, 8vo; by W. Urwick, 1865, 2 vols. A treatise based on this work by O. Glover, *Lond.* [*Camb. printed*], 1866, 8vo.

——— **Carson** (A.) God of Providence, the God of the Bible. 18mo. *Lond.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.
It is in vol 6 of Works, *Lond.*, 1864, 12mo.

——— **Stokes** (W.) Doctrine of special providence. 12mo. *Lond.*

Not in Brit. Mus.

——— **Martineau** (Jas.) The Scheme of Vicarious Redemption.

See 1845.

——— A Treatise on the sin of Adam. *Dublin.*

——— **Gadsby** (Will.) The Glory of God's Grace. 8vo. *Manchester.*

1840. A Treatise on the real nature of the sin of Adam. 12mo. *Lond.*

——— **Carson** (Alex.) History of providence as manifested in Scripture. 8vo. *Edinb.*

Also author of "History of Providence as unfolded in the Book of Esther," 3rd ed., *Dublin.*, 1835, 12mo. "The truth of the Gospel demonstrated from the character of God, manifested in the Atonement," 2nd ed., *Dubl.*, 1826, 8vo; 1857, 12mo.

1840—1. **Pilkington** (Geo.) Doctrine of Particular Providence. 12mo.

1840. **Tappan** (Hen. P.) The doctrine of Will, determined by an appeal to consciousness. 8vo. *New York.*

A work of considerable force and ability.

——— **Taylor** (Isaac) Man responsible for his dispositions. A Lecture. *London.*

——— **Smith** (Thyre T.) Hulsean Lecture for 1829; Man's responsibility in reference to his Religious belief explained. 8vo.

The author was vicar of Wymondham, Norfolk, 1848, d. 1852.

——— **Calvin** (John) Calvinism by Calvin; being the substance of discourses delivered by Calvin, and the other ministers of Geneva, on the doctrines of grace. With an intro. by Rev. R. Govett. 12mo. *Lond.*

——— General Redemption the doctrine of scripture. A letter by a clergyman of the Diocese of Cloyne. pp. 24. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Kern** (Friedr. Heinr.) Die Christliche Eschatologie und Prädestinations lehre erörtert..... pp. 136. 8vo. *Tubingen.*

——— **Gillespie** (W.) An examination of Antitheos's "Refutation of the argument for the being and attributes of God." pp. 214, 23. 8vo. *Lond.*

Printed at *Edinb.* Another ed., 1871, 8vo. A Refutation of Mr. Gillespie's Argument by R.H.B., *Lond.*, 1868, 8vo. "An Examination," by T[hos.] S[quire] B[arrett], *Lond.*, 1869, 8vo. 2nd edn., *Lond.*, 1871, 8vo.

——— **Arnold** (Fred.) Sermons. 8vo. *Lond.*

p. 193, On a particular providence.
Not apparently in B. M.

——— **Cooper** (Jas.) Sermons. 12mo. *Lond.*

p. 49, Man's responsibility to the call of God—p. 161, The grace of God the source of salvation.

——— **Simeon** (Chas.) Horæ homileticæ. 21 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*

Vol II., p. 325, Doctrine of a particular providence; vol 15, p. 312, Predestination considered; p. 329, Paul's assurance of persevering; p. 351, God's sovereign mercy the source of all our blessings; p. 358, God's sovereignty not to be arraigned; vol 19, p. 6, Effectual calling.

1840. **Blair** (Sam.) Infant Salvation scripturally considered. 8vo

——— **Paulus** (E. Ph.) Die Vorsehung, oder üb. das Eingreifen Gottes in das menschliche Leben. 8vo. *Stuttg.*

——— **Vilmar** (W.) Was fasst der bibl. Begriff d. Sünde in sich, und giebt es nach diesem eine Erbsünde? *Cassell.*

——— **Ehrard** (J. H. A.) Die Prädestinationsfrage aufs neue betrachtet, mit besonderer Rücksicht auf d. Unionsfrage. 8vo. *Erlangen.*

Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Norbech** (And. Erich.) Dissert. doctrinam ecclesiæ Lutheranæ et reform. de prædestinatione diversam tractatus. 4to. *Upsal.*

[1841.] **Palmer** (Will.) Enquiry into the Subject of offered Grace, &c. 12mo. *Lond.*

——— **Chatelain** (N.) Histoire du Synode de Dordrecht considéré sous ses rapports religieux et politiques. 8vo. *Paris.*

——— **Macara** (J.) Treatise on Redemption and Salvation. *Edinb.*

——— **Tappan** (Hen. P.) Doctrine of Will, Moral Agency. 8vo. *New York.*

This with his other two works (see 1839 and 1840), was republished, *Glasgow*, 1857, 8vo. The work is undoubtedly able, but in our view fails to give proper effect or place to motives. The author's idea of the effect of the fall is also unsound, and he fails to grasp the truth that by the first sin *every part* of man's being was injuriously affected.

——— **Bowles** (C.) A Serm. on the Covenant of Grace which God made with Abraham. 12mo. *Oxford.*

——— **Bray** (Chas.) The Philosophy of Necessity. 2 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*

Printed at Coventry. 2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1863, 8vo.

——— **Hook** (Walter Farquhar, *D.D.*) Sermons. 8vo. *Lond.*

p. 25, On a particular providence; p. 48, Predestination. The author was Vicar of Leeds; Preb. of Lincoln; Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen, and finally Dean of Chichester.

——— **Johnstone** (John) The way of Life, in a series of Sermons. 8vo. *Lond.*

p. 107, Original Sin. The author was Rector of Overton, Hants.

——— **Brown** (John, *D.D.*) Opinions on faith, divine influence, human inability, assurance, etc. 12mo. *Edinb.*

1841. **C.** The Providence of God. [By C.] 12mo

In Tracts on Christian Doctrine, vol 2.

——— **Neat** (Chas.) Discourses from the Philippians. 8vo. *Lond.*

P. 34, Phil. ii., 13, God working in His people; p. 119, The Covenant of grace. The author was Curate of Hatfield, Herts, and previously British Chaplain at Leghorn.

1841. **Stock** (John) Sermons. 8vo. *Lond.*
p. 1, The Call of God; p. 143, The particular providence of God. The author was vicar of Finchingfield, Essex.

——— **Burgh** (W.) Election, Predestination and Redemption. 12mo. *Lond.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Harrison** (J.) The Doctrine of Particular Redemption. 18mo. *Lond.*

——— **Vatke** (W.) Die menschliche Freiheit in ihrem Verhältniss zur Sünde und zur göttlichen Gnade wissenschaftlich dargestellt. 8vo. *Berlin*

——— **Macbair** (Robt. R.) The Goodness of Divine Providence explained and illustrated. pp. 249. 8vo
The author was a Wesleyan. d. 1856.

——— **Channing** (Will. E., *D.D.*) Works. 5 vols. 12mo. *Boston* [*U.S.*]
Contains "The Moral Argument against Calvinism;" other ed., *Glasg.*, 1840—44, 6 vols, 12mo; *Boston* [*U. S.*] 1846, 6 vols, 8vo; *Lond.*, 1855, 8vo; *Cambridge* [*U.S.*] 1875, 8vo; *Lond.*, 1880, p. lxxxiv, 764, 16mo. In French, *Paris*, 1857, 12mo.

——— **Smith** (James) Man, with his ability through the atonement to render himself acceptable to God. 8vo. *Albany* [*U.S.*]

——— **Weaver** (Robt.) The Reconciler; or the Harmony and Glory of the Divine Government. 8vo.

1842. **Wright** (G.) Sermon of Decrees.
Not in the Brit. Mus.

[1842.] **Thorn** (Will.) Antinomianism, its errors, evils and absurdities. 8vo. *Lond.*
The author was an Independent Minister.

1842. **Wodrow** (R.) History of Remarkable Providences. 4to. *London*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Stovel** (Charles) Hereditary claims to the Covenant of Grace. A Tract. 12mo. *Lond.*
Stovel wrote also a Serm. on "The Sovereignty of God."—*Lond.*, 1846, 12mo.

——— **Gaume** (Abbé J.) Catéchisme de persévérance. 8 vols. 12mo. *Brux.*
Various ed. An 8th, *Paris*, 1862, 8 vols, 8vo.
Translated into English from the 10th French ed, 1883, 4 vols, 8vo.

——— The certainty of the origin of evil in the World, etc. By a Layman. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Haldane** (Jas. Alex.) Man's responsibility. 12mo. *Edinb.*
The author was for some time pastor at the Tabernacle, Leith Walk, Edinburgh. He was brother of Rob. Haldane, the author of the "Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans," thought so highly of by the Calvinists, but which is not a work of any great merit in the eyes of those differing from them in theological views.

——— **Brazer** (John) The apparent darkness of God's Providence. 12mo. *Boston* [*U.S.*]

[1842.] **Stock** (John, *LL.D.*) The Doctrine of Election explained and vindicated. 8vo. *Lond.*

[1842.] ——— The Free invitations of the Gospel reconcileable with the doctrines of grace. 12mo. *Lond.*

1842. **Anderson** (J. S. M.) Redemption in Christ the true Jubilee. A Sermon. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Noel** (Hon. and Rev. Baptist W.) The Gospel of the Grace of God, illustrated in a series of meditations. 32mo. *Lond.*

——— **Pilkington** (Jas.) Works. 8vo. *Cambridge.*
p. 673, Tractatus de prædestinatione. The author was Bp. of Durham.

——— **Ramsey** (Alex.) The Election of Grace. 18mo. *London.*

——— **Bleby** (Hen.) Jehovah's Decree of Predestination. A Sermon. pp. 20. 12mo. *Lond.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.
The author was a Wesleyan.

——— **Long** (Geo.) Essay on the Moral Nature of Man. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **MacCombie** (Will.) Moral Agency. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Newnham** (W.) Reciprocal influence of Body and Mind. 8vo
(*Responsibility and Free Agency.*)

——— **Atkins** (Mary) M. A., or Nature and Grace. 12mo. *Lond.*

——— **Alford** (Dean Hen.) The consistency of the Divine Conduct in the doctrines of Redemption. 8vo. *Cambridge*
Hulsean Lect., for 1842. Part 2, 1843.

1843. **Kemp** (E. C.) Exposition of differences between Scripture and Calvinism. 8vo. *Lond.*
A very valuable and able exposition. The author was Rector of Whissonset, and Domestic Chaplain to the Duke of Cambridge.

——— **Merry** (Will.) Predestination and Election considered Scripturally. 18mo. *Lond.*

——— Disquisitiones de Deo. 8vo. *Lucani.*
Contains:—De voluntate Dei, de gratia, de prædestinatione sanctorum et reprobatione improborum.

——— **Coleridge.**—On Redemption. 12mo.

——— **Watson** (Alex.) Sermons. 8vo. *Lond.*
p. 1, Original sin and its remedy; p. 39, Redemption Universal. The author was Vicar of St. Mary, near Torquay, 1850; and in 1858, became Incumbent of Bedford Chapel, Bloomsbury.

——— **Williams** (Alfred) Jacob and Esau. Sermon on Rom. ix, 12. 3 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*
In vol 3, p. 234. 2 vols (*Lond.*, 1836—39, 8vo), only one apparently in the B. M. The author was Rector of Culmington.

1843. **Cudworth** (Will.) Aphorism concerning the assurance of Faith. 8vo
The author was minister of Grey Eagle Street Chapel.

——— **Audin** (M.) Histoire de la Vie, des Ouvrages, et des doctrines de Calvin. 2 vols. *Paris.*

1844. **Smith** (Will., *D.D.*) What is Calvinism? 12mo
2nd ed., *Philad., U. S.*, 1854, 12mo. The author was a Presbyterian.

——— **Smyth** (Thos., *D.D.*) Calvin and his enemies. 18mo. *Philad.*, [*U.S.*]
The Author was Pastor of the Presbyterian Ch. of Charleston and Carolina. See Men of the Time, *N. York*, 1854, 474.

——— **Cairns** (W., *LL.D.*) Treatise on Moral Freedom. pp. 496. 8vo. *Lond.*
This is the work of a profound thinker. The Author was Prof. of Logic and Belles Lettres in Belfast Coll. His general design is to view Moral Agency and Responsibility, but especially Moral Freedom and Volition in connection with the operations of the Intellectual Principles. In Part V., Dr. Cairns deals ably with the remarks of Edwards concerning the Foreknowledge of events implying their necessity, and with Permissive Decrees in connection with Foreknowledge, and their consistency with Free Agency.

——— **Dalton** (E.) The Watchful Providence of God. Sermons. 12mo. *Dubl.*
The author was Rector of Tramore.

——— **Marshall** (A.) The Catholic Doctrine of Redemption, *Lond.*

——— **Robertson** (John) Brief exposition of the 9th chapter to the Romans in a Letter. pp. 48. 12mo. *Edinb.*

——— **Vance** (Robt.) Feelings of man in his passage from the state of nature to the state of grace. 18mo
2nd ed., *Dubl.*, 1863, 8vo. The copy in the Brit. Mus. is *Lond.*, 1845, 8vo.

——— Supplementary additions to the "Certainty of the Origin of Evil." 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Allies** (Thomas Will.) Sermons on the Epistle to the Romans. 8vo. *Oxford.*
p. 117, Jewish and Christian adoption; p. 138, Election the same in principle now as of old; p. 158, The law by Moses, grace and truth by Jesus Christ.

——— **Brereton** (John) The doctrine of Election considered with reference to the Ministerial office. 8vo. *Lond.*
The author was Vicar of Poddington, Bedfordshire.

——— **C.** Essays on Providence. 16mo. *Portobello.*

——— **Edwards** (Hen., *LL.D.*) Providence, a poem, and other pieces. 2 vols. 8vo. [*Presteign printed*].

——— **Gaskin** (John) Sermons. 8vo. *Bristol.*
p. 78. The captivity of the natural man, and the emotions which his deliverance calls forth; p. 104, Preciousness of Redemption.

1844. **Jay** (Will.) Works. 12 vols. 12mo. *Bath.*
Vol 9, p. 1, Mistakes concerning the number of the righteous. p. 375, Assurance. The author was a dissenting divine, 62 years minister of Argyle Chapel, Bath.

——— **Knox** (Alex.) Remains. 3rd ed. 4 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*
Vol 2, p. 286, On Divine Providence.

——— **Warter** (John Wood) Plain and Practical Sermons. 2 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*
Vol 2, p. 211. The fall of Man.

——— Morning Exercises at Cripplegate. 5th ed. 6 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*
Vol 1, p. 369. How are we to live by faith in Divine Providence.—Thos. Lye. Vol 6, p. 372, The Possibility of Assurance.—R. Fairclough.
There was an earlier edition of this work, 1660, 4to.

——— **Thomas** (John W.) Nescience *v.* Prescience. pp. 24. 12mo. *Lond.*
The author was a Wesleyan.

——— **Taylor** (Chas. B.) Responsibility. 8vo
The author was Rector of St. Peter's, Chester, and after of Otley, Suffolk.

1845. **Bagshaw** (G.) A Glance at Calvinism. 12mo. *Lond.*
The work was printed at Market Rasen, and is designed to show the inconclusiveness of Calvinism.

——— **Martineau** (James) The Scheme of Vicarious Redemption.
A Lecture.

——— **White** (Will.) Providence, Prophecy, and Popery. 12mo. *Edinb.*

——— **Silver** (Jos. S.) The Philosophy of evil, shewing its uses and unavoidable necessity. 8vo. *Philad.* [*U.S.*]

——— **Hasting** (Hen. Jas.) Parochial Sermons. 8vo. *Lond.*
p. 175. The corruption of human nature. In another vol., *Lond.*, 1846, 8vo, is a sermon on Providence. The author was Rector of Areley King's.

——— **Reading** (T. M.) Divine Permission of Moral Evil. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Le Page** (W.) Redemption, its Nature and Connection with the Death of Christ. *Leeds.*

——— The irresistibility of the Holy Spirit's Influence . . . . irrational and unscriptural. By a Wesleyan Layman. pp. 50. 8vo. *Edinb.*

——— **Gorman** (J. B.) Philosophy of Animated existence.
(*Providence.*)

[1845.] **Bull** (John) An Essay on the Origin of Evil. 8vo. *Lond.*

1845. **Petri** (Ludw. Ad.) Gnade und Wahrheit aus den heil. Evangelien. 8vo. *Hanov.*

——— **Allen** (Will.) Moral Freedom conferred only by the Gospel. A Serm. 8vo.

1845. **Bledsoe** (Albert Taylor) An Examination of President Edwards's Freedom of the Will. 12mo. *Philad.*

——— **Balmer** (Robt.) Academical Lectures and pulpit discourses.
2 vols. 8vo. *Edinb.*
1, p. 226, On Providence; vol 2, p. 459, the Full Assurance of hope. Also author of "Redemption from death and the grave," 2 sermons, *Alnwick*, 1844, 12mo, and "Remarks on the doctrine of Divine decrees," 1853, 8vo.

——— **Cosin** (John, *D.D.*) Works, now first collected. 5 vols. 8vo. *Oxford.*
Vol 2. Serm. and substance of the conference at York house concerning Mr. Montague's book, see ante p. 103. Dr. Cosin was Bp. of Durham in the 17th Century; Vice Chancellor of the Cambridge Univ. 1640, and 1671—2.

——— **Payne** (Geo., *LL.D.*) The doctrine of original sin; or the native state and character of man unfolded.
8vo. *Lond.*
Another ed., same place, 1849, 12mo, and 1854, 8vo.

1846. **Peddie** (James, *D.D.*) Discourses.
8vo. *Edinb.*
p. 363. The Mysteries of Providence (2 serm.). The author was minister of Briste Street Congregation, Edinb., 1783—1845.

——— **Caswall** (E.) Sermons on the seen and unseen. 8vo. *Lond.*
p. 143, Christ's secret providence.

——— **Gough** (J. B.) History of, or Hand of Providence. 18mo. *Lond.*

——— **McCullock** (T.) Calvinism, the doctrine of Scripture. 12mo. *Lond.*

——— **Foote** (James) Treatise on Effectual calling. 8vo. *Edinb.*
"We cordially recommend this little volume as well adapted to awaken the careless, and to instruct and encourage the thoughtful."—*Bap. Mag*
The author was minister of the Free East Church, Aberdeen.

——— **Hagenbach** (K. R.) Compendium of the history of doctrines, translated by Carl W. Buch.
2 vols. p. 496; p. 484. 8vo. *Edinb.*
Very valuable. Vol 1, p. 285. Doctrines respecting Anthropology; vol ii, p. 1, Anthropology; p. 49, Predestination; p. 236, Anthropology, Justification and economy of redemption; and in other places. The author was Dr. and Prof. of Theology in the Univ. of Basle.

——— **Allan** (Robert) Review of the Calvinistic creed, or truth against prevailing error. 8vo. *Glasgow.*
Another ed., *Lond.*, 1847.

——— **Weller** (James) A Brief reply to the scandals cast upon the doctrines of Free Grace, *etc.*
12mo. *Robertsbridge.*

——— **Andrewes** (Lancelot) A pattern of catechistical doctrine. 8vo. *Oxf.*
p. 289. Judgment of the Lambeth Articles, annexed to which is the judgment of the censure upon Barret. The author was successively Bp. of Chichester, Ely and Winchester, d. 1626. In his epitaph his character is thus summed up;—"Indefensa opera in studiis; summa sapientia in rebus; assidua pietate in Deum; profusa largitione in egenos; rara amœnitate in suos; spectata probitate in omnes, æternum admirandus."

1846. **Brydges** (Sir S. E.) Human Fate. Poems. 8vo. *Great Totham.*

——— **Watson** (R.) Universal Redemption. 12mo. *Lond.*
The author was a Wesleyan, and Secretary of its Missionary Society, d. 1833. The work is not apparently in the B. M.

1847. **McCheyne** (Robt. M.) Sermons.
2 vols. 8vo. *New York.*
Another ed., 1853, 12mo. The author was minister at St. Peter's Church, Dundee, 1836.

——— **Baker** (Arthur) Sermons.
8vo. *Lond.*
p. 231, Mark vii, 37, God's Providence.

——— Bibliotheca Sacra and Theological Review. 8 vols. 8vo. *Andover* [*U.S.*]
Vol. 4, p, 77, Consistency of the the Eternal purpose of God with the free agency of man; vol 5, p. 205, The Pelagian Controversy.

——— **D'Oyly** (Geo.) Sermons.
2 vols. 8vo. *London.*
p. 103, The fall of man; p. 127, Original Sin; p. 210, The Election of Christians.

——— **Kennaway** (Chas. Edw.) Serms.
2nd series. 12mo. *Lond.*
p. 160. The particular providence of God in creation and in the world (2 serm.).

——— **Maunder** (Geo.) Full Assurance.
pp. 99. 12mo. *Manchester*

——— **Sworde** (Thos.) Exposition of the first 17 Articles of the Church of England. 8vo. *London* [*Cambridge*].

——— **Beck** (C.) Ueber die Prædestination.
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Kirk** (J.) Predestination examined. 18mo. *Lond.*

——— The Triumphs of Grace, and the Mysteries of Providence. 12mo. *Lond.*

——— **Murdue** (W.) The Arminian and Calvinist. fcp. *Lond.*

——— **Hull** (W.) Essays on Calvinism.
12mo. *Lond.*

——— [**Ponsonby** (Catherine)] The Mysteries and Triumph of providence and grace. 12mo. *Lond.*
Anothe ed., same place, 1848, 18mo.

——— **Herrick** (Joseph) Salvation certain and complete. 32mo
Also same year, "Greatness of God's mercy," 18mo.

——— **Leemhins** Libertâs volendi.

——— **Arms** (Heram P.) The Mystery of Providence, A Discourse.
8vo. *Norwich* [*U.S.*]

[1847.] **Chapman** (J.) A correspondence between, and Mr. Coles.....wherein is shewn that eternal election, particular redemption, final perseverance, etc., are Holy Doctrines of the word of God.
pp. 12. 12mo. *Lond.*
Scarce.
The author was a Baptist minister at Ledbury.

[1847.] **Wakeham** (W.) An exposition of the six following subjects:— ..... A development of the harmony of divine sovereignty with the responsibility of man. 12mo. *Devonport.*

1848. **Greene** (W. B.) Remarks in refutation of the treatise of Edwards on the Freedom of the Will. 12mo.

——— **Brocas** (Thos.) Anti-Calvinism, or the key which unlocks scriptural Election. 12mo. *Shrewsbury.*

——— **M'Clelland** (George) Predestination and Election vindicated from dependence on Moral Necessity, and reconciled with Freewill.
pp. 237. 16mo. *Edin.*
A very valuable and sound work, laying bare the weak points of the system of Edwards.

——— **Birks** (T. R.) The Mystery of Providence. A Historical exposition of Rom. viii., 9. 16mo. *Lond.*
Birks also wrote on "The Atonement," *Lond.*, 1870, 8vo; and "The Propitiatory Sacrifice," *Lond.*, 1864, 12mo; and "Difficulties of Belief in connection with the creation, Fall, Redemption, and Judgment," 2nd ed., 1876, 8vo.

——— **Marsh** (Edward Garrard) The Bampton Lecture for 1848; The Fall and its effect treated. 8vo. *Lond.*
The author was Canon of Southwell.

——— **Surtees** (Scott F.) Sermons for the people. 12mo. *Lond.*
One on Original Sin. The date in the B. M. Cat. is 1845—46.

——— **Tate** (Thomas) Sermons.
12mo. *Lond.*
p. 212, The work of grace begun, and perfected by God. The author was Vicar of Edmonton, London.

——— **Dewdney** (Edmund) Treatise on the special providence of God.
16mo. *Lond.*

——— **Jacocks** (A. B.) General Features of the Moral Government of God.
12mo. *Boston* [*U.S.*]

——— **Rutherford** (Alexander C.) Lects. on the Doctrine of Election.
8vo. *Glasg.*
Another ed., *Phila.*, *U.S.*, 1855, 12mo.

——— **Brown** (Stafford) Truth on both sides; or can the believer finally fall?
12mo. *Lond.*
"A useful book, with passages of considerable interest."—*British Mag.* "Replete with good things."—*Church and State Gaz.* The author was Perpetua Curate of Christ Church.

——— Covenant and Grace. 16mo.
Lond.

——— Riches of Grace. 12mo. *Boston.*

[1848.] **[Oakeshott** (J.)] A tract for the times! Dialogues between a Calvinist and Arminian, &c. 8vo. *Brighton.*

1849 [1850.] **Dyer** (Thos. H.) Life of John Calvin. 8vo. *Lond.*
A careful and elaborate work, mainly grounded on original documents and Calvin's epistles.

1849. **Sheean** (T. St. G.) The Power of Grace. 18mo. *Bath.*

——— **Foster** (Randolph S.) Objections to Calvinism as it is.
pp. 310. 12mo. *New York.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Burn** (J.) Predestination.
18mo. *Lond.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Morison** (James) An exposition of the IX. chapter to the Romans.
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Adams** (Nehemiah) The Assurance of Faith. A Serm.
8vo. *Boston* (*U.S.*)

——— **Leask** (W.) The Great Redemption. 8vo.

——— **Cumming** (John) God in History; or, Facts illustrative of the presence and providence of God in the affairs of men. 16mo. *Lond.*
Other ed., 1855, 8vo, and 1864, 8vo. Also Author of "Infant salvation, or all saved that die in infancy," *Lond.* [1842], 12mo. 2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1846, pp. 104, 8vo.

——— **Walford** (Edw.) On original or Birth Sin A prize essay. 8vo. *Lond.*
Printed at Bristol.

——— **Houghton** (W.) An examination of Calvinism, &c., together with a view of the rise of the predestinarian doctrines. 2nd ed. 12mo. *Lond.*

——— **Hussey** (Robt.) Sermons.
8vo. *Oxford.*
p. 365, Calling and election made sure. The author was Regius Prof. of Eccles. Hist., Oxford, and Whitehall Preacher.

——— **Newman** (John Hen.) Discourses.
8vo. *Lond.*
p. 132, Perseverance in grace—p. 154, Nature and grace, and illuminating grace—p. 275, Mysteries of nature and grace.

——— **Burns** (Jabez) Doctrinal Conversations on Predestination, Free Will, &c. 24mo. *Lond.*

——— **Short** (Will.) Sermons.
8vo. *Lond.*
p. 349, The Providence of God. The author was Rector of St. George the Martyr, Queen's Square, London.

——— **Goad** (J.) Memorandum of the Providence of God. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Harris** (Dr. John) Man Primeval, or the Constitution and Primitive Condition of the human being. 8vo.

1850. **Wordsworth** (Christ., *D.D.*) Occasional Sermons.
4 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*
Vol 1, p. 69, An inquiry whether the baptismal offices of the Church of England may be interpreted in the Calvinistic sense, &c.

——— **Freemantle** (W. R.) The Divine Sovereignty in the Election of the nation [Israel], a sermon. 12mo. *Lond.*

——— **Villiers** (H. M.) Divine Grace in the protection of Israel, and in providential dispensations to them.
12mo. *Lond.*

1850. **Alford** (Hen.) Sermons. 8vo. *Lond.*
p. 81, The stewardship of grace. The work was printed at Leicester.

——— **Bland** (Philip) Plain Parish Sermons. 8vo. *Lond.*
p. 218, Christian assurance. p. 239, Christian Liberty.

———**McCosh** (Jas., *LL.D.*) The Method of Divine Government, physical and moral. 8vo. *Edinb.*
3rd ed., 1852; 4th, 1855; 5th, *Lond.*, 1856, 8vo; 1860, 8vo; 9th ed., *Lond.*, 1867, 8vo; 10th ed., 1874, 8vo; *New York*, 1880, pp. xiii, 549, 8vo. "A work of pre-eminent merit."—*North Brit. Rev.* "One of the first books of the age."—*Dr. Charles Hodge, of Princeton.* The author was Prof. of Logic and Mathematics in Queen's College, Belfast.

——— **Wilberforce** (Robt. Isaac) Sermons on the new birth of man's nature. 8vo. *Lond.*
Printed at Derby. p. 305, Predestination.

——— **McAll** (Sam.) Lectures. 8vo.
p. 103, Human responsibility. The author was a nonconformist minister of Castle Gate Meeting House, Nottingham.

——— **Ryle** (John Charles) Assurance.
The author is now Bishop of Liverpool.

[1850.] **Blakey** (Robert) On Moral Good and Evil. 8vo.
The author is best known for his History of the Philosophy of the mind, *Lond.*, 1848, 4 vols, 8vo.

1850. **Browne** (Edw. Harold) Exposition of the 39 Articles. 2 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*
4th ed., 1858, 8vo, and various later, 1858, 1864, 1871, 1874, 1878, 1882, all 8vo. The Norrison Prof. of Divinity, Camb., and after successively Bishop of Ely, and of Winchester.

[1850.] **Collins** (Charles, *D.D.*) Methodism and Calvinism compared.
Not in the Brit. Mus.
The author was President of the Emory and Henry College, Va. (Amer.) from 1838 to 1852, in which year he became President of Dickinson College, Pa.

——— **Tweedie** (W. K., *D.D.*) Man by Nature and by Grace. 12mo. *Edin.*
The author was Pastor of the Free Tolbooth Church, Edinb., and also trans. from the French "Calvin and Servetus," *Edinb.*, 1846, 8vo.

——— **Dieckhoff** (August. Wilhem) De Carolostadio Lutheranæ de servo arbitrio doctrinæ contra Eckium defensore. 8vo. *Gottingæ.*

——— **Whitcomb** (Will. C.) The Mysteries of God's Providence. 2 Serm. 8vo. *Andover* [*U.S.*]

1851. **Hardwick** (Charles) History of the 39 Articles. 8vo. *Cambridge.*
Another ed., same place, 1859, 8vo; *Philadel.* (Amer.), 1852, 8vo; *Lond.*, 1876, 12mo. The author was Fellow of St. Catherine's Hall, and Whitehall Preacher.

——— **Macdonald** (J.) The Doctrine of Divine Grace. *Lond.*

——— **Tideman** (J.) De Remonstrantie en het Remonstrantisme. 8vo. *Haarl.*
Also author of "Historisch overzigt der catechetische literatuur der Remonstranten," *Rotterdam*, 1852, 8vo.

1851. **Black** (F. G.) Lectures on the Sovereignty.... .. of God. 12mo. *Cincinnati.*

——— **Mahan** (Asa) Lectures on the 9th of Romans, Election. 16mo. *Boston.*
The author also wrote on the Will, 16mo.

——— **Davis** (W.) The Believer's Assurance of Salvation, is it attainable? 18mo. *Lond.*

——— **Bennett** (Will. J. E.) The last Sermons preached at St. Paul's, Knightsbridge, and St. Barnabas, Pimlico. 8vo. *Lond.*
p. 1, God's Grace and man's co-operation. (2 serm.)

——— **Fish** (Wilbur.) The Calvinistic Controversy, embracing a sermon on Predestination and Election. pp. 273. 12mo. *New York.*
Against Calvinism.

——— **Cochrane** (James) Discourses on some of the more difficult texts of Scripture. 8vo. *Edinb.*
p. 123, Rom. ix., 6-24, General view of the doctrine of God's eternal decrees.
p. 145, Rom. ix., 19-21, Sovereignty of God in predestination.
p. 172, Rom. ix., 15-16, Sovereignty of God in Election.
p. 193, Rom. ix., 15-16, Doctrine of Election practically considered.
p. 212, Rom. ix., 15-21, Sovereignty of God in reprobation.

——— **Currey** (Geo.) The preparation for the Gospel, as exhibited in the history of the Israelites. The Hulsean Lect. for 1851. 8vo. *Camb.*
p. 1, The election of the seed of Abraham.

——— **Taylor** (Geo.) The Indications of the Creator; or the Natural evidences of Final Cause. 12mo. *New York.*

——— **Fenelon** (François de Salignac de la Motte) Œuvres complètes. 10 vols. imp. 8vo. *Paris.*
vol 2, Refutation du système du père Malebranche, sur la nature et la grace. Lettre au P. Lami, sur la grace et la prédestination. Vols 4 and 5, Sur le Jansénisme. Fenelon was the well-known Archbp. of Cambray, d. 1715.

——— **Mill** (John Stuart) A System of logic, ratiocinative and inductive. 3rd ed., 2 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*
vol 1, Causation.
vol 2, Chance, causation, liberty and necessity.

——— **Tregelles** (S. Prideaux, *LL.D.*) Jansenists, their rise, etc A chapter in Church History. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Trevor** (George) Sermons on the doctrines and means of grace. 12mo. *Lond.*
One on original sin. "Excellent sound sermons."—*John Bull.* The author was Canon of York.

1852. **Wyld** (Joseph W.) Man's purposes crossed by God's providences. A serm. 12mo. *Southampton and Lond.*

1852. Morisonianism refuted. A view of the Rev. James Morison's Exposition of the 9th chapter to the Romans. 12mo. *Paisley.*

——— **Heath** (D. J.) The future kingdom of Christ; or, Man's heaven to be this earth. A solution of the Calvinistic and other chief difficulties in theology, by distinguishing the saved nations from the glorified saints. 8vo. *Lond.*
The author was Vicar of Brading, Isle of Wight.

——— **Phelan** (William, *D.D.*) Remains. 2nd ed. 2 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*
Vol 1, p. 233, The 17th Article.

——— **Mackenzie** (C. A.) Sin and Grace. Early Life, &c., of a soldier. 18mo. *Lond.*

——— Theology of the Anglican Reformers, with extracts from their Writings on the Doctrines of.....Predestination, etc. 8vo.

——— **MacVicar** (John G., *D.D.*) An Enquiry into Human Nature. 8vo. *Edinb.*

——— **Actorie** ( ) De l'origine et de la réparation du mal. 8vo. *Paris.*

——— **Bacheler** (Tappan Hilton) Salvation conditional. A Serm. 12mo.

——— **Whitecross** (John) Providence displayed. 12mo. *Edinb.*

——— **Zijnen** (F. P. J. S.) Anselmi et Calvini placita de hominum per Christum a peccato redemptione inter se conferuntur. pp. 156. 8vo. *Delphis.*

——— **Dupac de Bellegarde** (G.) Histoire abrégée de l'Eglise métropolitaine d'Utrecht, 1568—1784. 3rd ed. 8vo. *Utrecht.*

1853. **Dalgairns** (John Dobree) The Devotion of the Heart of Jesus. pp. xii, 235. 8vo. *Lond.*
With an Introd. on the history of Jansenism. 2nd ed., *Lond.* [*Derby printed.*], 1854, 8vo. In French, *Paris*, 1868, 12mo.

——— **Pearson** (Thomas) Infidelity, its aspects, causes, and agencies. 8vo. *Lond.*
Naturalism, or the denial of the divine providential government. Indifferentism, or the denial of man's responsibility.
People's ed., 1854, 32mo; 1857; *New York*, 1854, 8vo. "A popular but instructive book."—Farrar, Crit. Hist. of Free Thought, 1863, Lect. I.

——— **Bleby** (Henry) Christian Predestination not Fatalism. 12mo. pp. 90. *Lond.*
A Wesleyan.

——— **Roberts** (Richard) The Reign of Providence. A Serm. 12mo. pp. 34. *Bristol.*
The author was a Wesleyan.

——— **Plumer** (William Swan, *D.D.*, *LL.D.*) The Grace of Christ. 12mo.

——— **Harvey** (W. W.) Sermons for young men on the Grace of Christ. 8vo.

1853. **Ballantyne** (John) On the Origin of Evil. 8vo.
Also author of a tract "On the Being of a God," 8vo.

——— **Buchanan** (Rob., *D.D.*) The Purpose of God illustrated by the Providence of God. A Disc. 8vo. *Glasg.*

——— **Burton** (Joseph) Election. A Serm. 12mo. *Cambridge.*
The author was a Dissenting Minister.

——— **Devol** (C.) Evidences of the Wisdom and Goodness of God, as displayed in Creation and Providence. A Lecture. 8vo. *Albany.* [*U. S.*]

——— **Frame** (James) Original Sin. 8vo. *Lond.* [*Dundee printed.*]
2nd ed., *Lond.* [*Glasgow printed*, 1871], 8vo.

——— **Ellis** (Geo. Edw.) Redemption. A Serm. 8vo. *Boston* [*U.S.*]

——— **Beecher** (Edw.) The Conflict of Ages: or the great debate on the moral relations of God and Man. 12mo. *Lond.* [*Boston printed.*]

——— **Gladstone** (John Eddowes) Baptismal Grace. 8vo. *Lond.*

1854. **Ferguson** (Fergus) Bible Election. pp. 180. 12mo. *Glasgow.*
These are letters to "Anti-Pelagius," a minister of the Free Church, on the principal points of the Calvinistic controversy.

——— **Knight** (Robert) The doctrine of Scriptural Predestination briefly stated and considered. pp. 83. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Aitken** (Robt.) Certainty of Grace. 8vo. *Lond.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.
Author of "High Truth. The Christian Vocation," &c., *Lond.*, 1866, 8vo.

——— Original Sin. Congregational Lect. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Townsend** (T. T.) The Providence of God. 12mo. *Lond.*

——— **Lang** (D.) Oneness of Providence. 18mo.

——— **Alister** (R.) [**Robertson** (Alexander)] Belief in Special Providences examined. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Wiggers** (G. F.) Schicksale d Augustinischen Anthropologie v. d. Verdammung d. Semipelagianismus bis z. Reaction d. Mönchs Gottschalk. 8vo. *Ausschn.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Guilton** (l'Abbé) L'homme relevé de sa chute, ou Essai s. le Péché originel et les fruits de la Rédemption. 2 vols. 8vo. *Paris.*

——— **Closs** (John) A Tract on Election, War, Peace, etc. 2nd ed. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Wright** (Jos.) The nature and capabilities of man, briefly considered, with reference to the question of human accountableness. 8vo. *Lond.*

[1854.] **Wilkins** (Jos.) Infant Salvation. A Serm. 12mo. *Lond.*

1854. **Dale** (Thos.) God's providential care of children. A Serm.
8vo. *Thames Ditton* [*printed.*]

1855. **Sanford** (M.) Punitive Justice.
p. 558, Providence.

——— **Colvin** (John) National Fatalism indirectly disproved. A Serm. 8vo.
(On Deut. VIII., 19-20.)

——— **Whish** (John Chas.) The First Cause; or a Treatise on the Being and Attributes of God.
8vo. *Lond.* [*Thames Ditton printed.*]
The author was Incumbent of Trinity Church, East Peckham, Kent.

——— **Boyd** (John) On the Sovereignty of God. pp. 456. 8vo. *Edinb.*
The author was Minister of the Presbyterian Church, Moyvore.

——— **Mozley** (J. B., *D.D.*) A Treatise on the Augustinian Doctrine of Predestination. 8vo. *Lond.*
2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1878. In his 2nd vol of "Essays, Historical and Theological," *Lond.*, 1878, 2 vols, 8vo, is one on "The Principle of Causation."

——— Grace All-sufficient. fcap. *Lond.*

——— Grace and Glory. [Poems by C. E. A.] 12mo. *Lond.*

——— **Baker** (Will. Rich.) Anti-Mysticism, or Man in his relation to the Holy Spirit, revealed will, and divine grace.
12mo. *Lond.*

——— **Swinburn** (Allan) God's Providence—Ordinary and Extraordinary. A Serm. 12mo. *Lond.* [*Hull printed.*]

——— **Topham** (E. C.) The Philosophy of the Fall and its remedy.
pp. 370. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Hodgson** (Francis, *D.D.*) The Calvinistic Doctrine of Predestination examined and refuted. 18mo *Philad.*
A member of the Pennsylvania Methodist Conference.

——— Is the Immaculate conception true? or, an Inquiry into the doctrine of Original Sin. 8vo. *Dubl.*

[1855.] **Lowe** (Josiah B.) Baptismal Grace and its appropriate phraseology.
12mo.

——— **James** (Henry) The nature of evil considered. 12mo. *New York.*
A native of Albany, New York.

——— **Webster** (C.) Arminianism, or Divine Sovereignty contrasted with the Arminian doctrine of Predestination.
18mo. *Philad., U.S.*
Against Arminianism. Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Lyall** (William) Intellect, the Emotions and the Moral Nature.
8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Sheldon** (D. N., *D.D.*) Sin and Redemption; a series of Sermons; to which is added an Oration on Moral Freedom. 12mo. *New York.*
2nd ed., *Boston, U.S.*, 1856, 8vo. "A model work in point of directness, explicitness, honesty, and candour."—*A. P. Peabody, D.D., N. Amer. Rev.*, April, 1855. 572. The author was a Baptist minister.

1855. **Squier** (Miles P., *D.D.*) The Problem solved; or Sin not of God.
12mo. *New York.*
The author was Prof. of Intellectual and Moral Philosophy, in Beloit Coll., Wisconsin, U.S

——— **Case** (Ira) A Letter to Dr. Tylor respecting his discourse on human ability and Inability. 8vo. *Hanover* [*U.S.*]

1856. **Rogge** (H. C.) Coolhaes, de voorlooper *v.* Arminius en der Remonstanten. 2 vols. 8vo. *Amst.*

——— **MacDonald** (D.) The Creation and Fall. 8vo. *Edinb.*
"A work equally distinguished for its ability and its learning,"—*Kurtz's Old Covenant.* The author was minister of the Free Church, Edinkillie.

——— [**Knight** (Robt.)] The meeting of truth and error, in a dialogue between two ministers, one an Arminian and the other a Calvinist.
pp. 12. 12mo. *Lond.*

——— **Maurial.** Origenis de libertate Arbitrii doctrina Disputatio philosophica. 8vo. *Monspel.*
Rare.

——— **Solly** (Thos.) The Will Divine and Human. pp. 291. 8vo. *Cambridge.*
An exceptionally valuable work. The 1st book which treats of the human will is one of the finest and ablest contributions on the subject extant. The true Christian spirit is linked with the philosophical mind, the reasoning close, and the conclusions accurate. So much cannot be said of Book II. which treats of the Divine Will. The author was a Barrister-at-Law, and Lecturer on the English language and literature at the Univ. of Berlin.

——— **Parks** (Will.) Five Sermons on the Five Points. 12mo. *Lond.*
2nd ed., 1858, pp. 111, 12mo. The author was Incumbent of Openshaw, near Manchester, and a Calvinist.

——— **Collins** (John) The Fall of Man. A Poem. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Steere** (Dr. Ed.) An Essay on the existence and attributes of God. 8vo.

——— **Bledsoe** (A. T.) A Theodicy.
8vo. *New York.*
Another ed., *Lond.*, 1864, 8vo.

——— **Geare** (Edw.) Essays on Providence. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— Dialogues on Divine Providence.
12mo. *Lond.*
Contains, I, God the Worker—II, Special Providence—III, Details and Difficulties—IV, The Purpose of God.

——— **Young** (Dr. John) The Mystery, or Evil and Good. 8vo. *Lond.*
2nd ed., 1861, 8vo. See 1858.

——— **Hackett** (Horatio (Balch.) Plutarch on the delay of Providence in punishing the wicked.
From Biblioth. Sacra, July, 1856. The author was Prof. of Hebrew and Biblical Interpretation in Newton Theological Institution, U.S.

——— **Hannah** (J.) Discourse on the fall and its results. 12mo. *Lond.*

1856. An Inquiry concerning the principles in the constitution of human nature which are the causes of moral evil. By a Layman. pp. 190. 8vo. *Lond.*
This is an attempt to demonstrate by induction from well-known facts, that certain principles existing in human nature are the causes of moral evil.

1857. **Hudson** (Chas. Fred.) Debt and Grace, as related to the Doctrine of a Future Life.
pp. viii, 472. 12mo. *Boston.*
Another ed., *New York*, 1862, pp. viii, 489, 12mo. A very able work, probably the most able in support of the doctrine of the extinction of the wicked.

——— **Banks** (John Waters) The Shunammite. Faith and Providence.
12mo. *Lond.*

——— **Moreau** (L.) La destinée de l'homme, ou du mal, de l'épreuve, et de la stabilité future.
pp. 375. 18mo. *Paris.*

——— **Orr** (John) Theism; a Treatise on God, Providence, and Immortality.
pp. v, 406. 8vo. *Lond.*
"The work deserves patient study by those who would appreciate the cumulate nature of the evidence which he passes in review."—*Westm. Rev.*, *Oct.*, 1857.

——— **Brooks** (John) A brief examination of the Common notions about Adam's Fall, Probation, Judgment, &c.
pp. 32. 12mo. *Boston.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.
The author was a Universalist.

——— **Wiefe** (Dr. L.) Die Bildung des Willens. Gine historische Betrachtung.
pp. 48. 8vo. *Berlin.*

——— **Carleton** (Hen.) Liberty and Necessity. 12mo. *Philadelph.*
The author was one of the judges of the Supreme Court of Louisiana.

——— **Rowton** (Rupert J.) Threefold Redemption from Guilt, Sin, and Death.
12mo. *Bath.*

——— **Mittl** (L.) Die Prädestinations— und Reprobations Lehre des heiligen Augustini. 4to. *Stadtamb.*

——— **Brown** (Henry) Arminian inconsistencies and errors. 8vo. *Philad.*
The author was a Divine of Pennsylvania.

——— **Atkinson** (Peter Righton) God's Providences compared with His grace. A Serm. 8vo. *Oxford.*

——— **Carpenter** (H.) Did Christ die for all men, or for the elect only? A Letter. 12mo. *Lond.*
The author was minister of St. Michael's, Liverpool.

——— **Chapin** (Edwin Hubbell) Divine Providence. A Serm. 8vo.

——— **Colani** (Timothée) Du libre arbitre et du péché, lettre a M. Scherer.
12mo.

1858. **Cowdy** (Samuel) The Great Election. An Appeal [on 2 Pet. i, 10.]
2nd ed. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— Rational and Irrational Beings, or the Will. 8vo. *Lond.* [*Bath printed.*]

1858. **Hayden** (William B.) On the History of the Dogma of Infant Damnation, &c. 8vo. pp. 32. *Portland*
For the doctrine concerning the nec. of *baptism* to salvation, see *Winer's Comparative Darstellung*, &c., S.15, pp.130—133. Its necessity is maintained in the Catholic symbols (see Conc. Trident. Sess., VII, can. 5, *Cat. Rom.* II, ii, 31, 33, 34), and the Lutheran Confessions, but is denied by Calvinists, by the Anabaptists, and by Arminians generally.

——— **Hillen** (W.) Quid de peccati originalis natura et propagatione Judicaverit Augustinus. 4to. *Warendorf.*

——— **Neale** (John Mason) History of the so-called Jansenist Church of Holland. 8vo. *Oxf.*
"Evidence of careful research and critical sagacity."—*Athen.*, 1858, 432. The author was Warden of Sackville Coll., East Grinstead, and a voluminous writer.

——— **Lyth** (John, *D.D.*) Divine Decrees. A Serm. pp. 16.
A Wesleyan minister.

——— **Macafee** (Daniel) Rev. C. H. Spurgeon's Two Bridges of Calvinism and Arminianism.
8vo. pp. 27. *Belfast.*

——— **Hughes** (J.) A Review of Mr. Spurgeon's Discourses: a new and complete refutation of Calvinism.
8vo. *Lond.*

——— **[Tarbet** (William)] Pastoral Teachings, Doctrinal and Practical.
2nd Series. pp. 179. 8vo. *Lond.*
p. 19, Election.

——— **Gay** (l'Abbé) Vue philosoph. de la chute de l'humanité en Adam.
8vo. *Avign.*

——— **Lutkens** (J.) Luthers Prädestinationslehre u. s. Lehre vom freien Willen.
Dorpat.

——— **Young** (John) Evil not from God: or the Mystery, being an Inquiry into the origin of Evil.
pp. 343. 12mo. *New York.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Davies** (Benjamin) "The Bright Side of Calvinism." 8vo. *Lond.*
Written in reply to Inward's (J.) "The Dark Side of Calvinism."

——— **Davis** (And. Jackson) The History and Philosophy of Evil.
2nd ed. 8vo. *Boston* [*U.S.*]
Also author of "The Philosophy of Special Providences," a Vision, 8th ed., *Boston* (*U.S.*), 1856, 8vo.

——— **D'Oyly** (Chas. John) A few words upon Election. 12mo. *Lond.*

——— **Fischer** (J. C.) Die Freiheit des menschlichen Willens. 8vo. *Leipzig.*

1858. **Groot** (P. Hofstede de) Het onderscheid van vrijheid van wil en vrijheid van handeling.
pp. 100. 8vo. *Groningen.*
Worth perusal.

——— **Helfferich** (Adolf.) Die Schule des Willens. pp. 66. 8vo. *Berlin.*

——— **Huber** (Joh.) Ueber die Willensfreiheit. pp. 66. 8vo. *München.*

——— **Hoekstra Bz** (S.) Vrijheid in verband met zelfbewustheid, zedelijkheid en zonde. Een psychologisch-ethische studie. 8vo. *Amst.*

——— **Chalmer** (E. B.) The Death of Jesus a propitiation for the sins of all mankind. A Serm. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Dixon** (Rob. Vickers) The Christian Assurance, its nature and grounds. A Serm. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Cadman** (Will) Christian Assurance. A Serm. 8vo.

1859. **Disney** (James Will. King) God's Providence England's safeguard. A Serm. 12mo. *Lond.*

[1859.] **Bomberger** (Johann. H. A.) Infant Salvation in its relation to infant depravity, &c. 8vo. *Philadelphia.*

1859. **Clemming** (J.) Chapter on Providence. (Ruth) *Lond.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Taylor** (Nathaniel W.) Lectures on the Moral Government of God.
2 vols. 8vo. pp. 417, 423.
The author was Dwight Prof. of Didactic Theol. in Yale Coll. His views were somewhat peculiar.

——— **Barnes** (Albert) The Atonement in its relations to Law and Moral Government.
pp. 358. 12mo. *Philadelphia* [*U.S.*]
Not in the Brit. Mus.
The author was Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia (Amer.) He is best known for his commentaries on the New Testament.

——— **Maunder** (G.) Doctrine of Full assurance.

——— **Morgan** (E.) Decrees and Free Agency.

——— **Goodhart** (C. J.) Glimpses of Grace and glory. 12mo.

——— **Bain** (Alexander) The Emotions and the Will. 8vo. *Lond.*
2nd ed., *London, Aberdeen* [*printed*], 1865, 8vo; 3rd ed., *Lond.*, [*Aberdeen printed*], 1875, 8vo.

——— **Bickersteth** (Robert) Redemption. A Serm. 12mo.
The author was Bishop of Ripon. He also pub. a Serm. on "The power of God in the believer," on Eph. i, 19th, 1854, 12mo.

[1859.] **Cooper** (John Edw.) The nature of Reprobation and the preacher's liability to it. A Serm.
8vo. *Cambridge* (*printed Norwich.*)

——— **Scholten** (J. H.) De vrije wil. Kritisch onderzoek. 8vo. *Leiden.*

1860. **Bayne** (R.) To parents.....On the Salvation of all dying before the age of accountability. A Serm. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— Arminianism *v.* Hyper-Calvinism, Letters from P. Pugh to the Rev. S. Cozens. 8vo. *Tunstall.*

——— **Scheffer** (J. G. de Hoop) De Providentia divina Teleiobaptistas Neerlandicos ab exitio vindicante. 8vo.

——— **Brown** (John Newton) The Death threatened to Adam, with its bearing on the Annihilation of the wicked.
pp. 29. 24mo. *Philadelphia.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Melguizo** (Atilano) Son mas los que se salvan que los que se condenan, ó sean razones en que se pundan los católicos que defienden esta opinion.
pp. xv, 462. 8vo. *Madrid and Paris.*
See Darling's *Cyclopædia Bibl.*, subjects (Script.) on Matt. xx, 16; xxii, 14.

——— **Ward** (Will. Geo.) On Nature and Grace. 8vo. *Lond.*
The author of "The Ideal of a Christian Church," *Lond.*, 1844, 8vo. The above work is dedicated to Cardinal Wiseman.

——— **Cronheln** (F. W.) Origin of Belief in Predestination. *Lond.*

——— **Blood** (B.) Optimism the lesson of ages, &c. 8vo. *Boston* [*U.S.*]
(*Origin of Sin.*)

——— Pious Arminians proved to be practical Calvinists.
16mo. *Lond.* [*Leeds printed.*]

——— **Baird** (Sam. J.) The First Adam and the Second. The Elohim revealed in the Creation and Redemption of Man. pp. 688. 8vo. *Philadelphia.*

——— Miranda, a Book on Creation and Providential administration of the World. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Drummond** (R. B.) Freewill in relation to Statistics. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— Caedmon. The Fall of Man, or Paradise Lost, translated in verse from the Anglo-Saxon, by W. H. F. Bosanquet. 8vo. *Lond.*

1861. **Tepe** (Geo.) Ueber die Freiheit und Unfreiheit des menschlichen Wollens. pp. 53. 8vo. *Bremen.*

——— **Burnside** (Will. Smyth) The Lex Evangelica, or Essays for the Times, being a reply to "Essays and Reviews."
8vo. *Dublin.*
p. 268, The Laws of Election and Predestination fairly stated. It is short, sound and Catholic. The author was Rector of the Parish of Castle Blayney.

——— **Benson** (Rich. Meux) Redemption. Sermons. 16mo. *Lond.*

——— **Morgan** (Ebenezer) Traethawd ar Beehoel Gwerddwl.
pp. 110. 12mo. *Holywell.*
A treatise on Original Sin.

1861. **Rouse** (Nathan) Man contemplated in his primeval, fallen, redeemed and millennial condition.
pp. 381. 12mo. *Lond.*
The author was a Wesleyan.

[1861.] **Weston** (Thos. W.) Effectual calling and salvation to the uttermost.
2 Serm. 8vo. *Lond.*

1861—66. **Rogge** (H. C.) Beschrijvende catalogues der pamfletten-verzameling van de Boekerij der Remonstrantsche Kerk te Amsterdam. 3 pts. 8vo. *Amst.*

1861. **Duncanson** (J.) Providence of God manifested in Natural Law.
8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Hunton** (J.) Re-examination of Calvinism. *Lond.*

——— **Baillie** (John, *D.D.*) Grace Abounding. 8vo. *Lond.*
Included for the title, but only on revivals. The author was Rector of Wivenhoe.

[1861.] **A[ppleyard]** (E. S.) The Fall and Redemption of Man. 16mo. *Lond.*

1861. The Attributes of the Deity. [In verse.] 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Coleman** (John) Prophecy unfolded; or Eternal Redemption, with providential agencies, &c. 8vo. *Lond.*

1862. **Shedd** (Will. G. T.) Discourses and Essays. pp. 324. 12mo.
Another ed., 1880.

——— **Eliot** (Philip Frank) The Fall of Man. 5 Serm. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Forbes** (Alexander Penrose) Sermons on the Grace of God and other cognate subjects. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Evans** (John S.) Christian Predestination. pp. 48. 8vo. *Quebec.*
An anti-calvinist work.

——— **Whateley** (Dr. Rich.) Election, an Essay. *Dub.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.

——— **Jackson** (T.) The Providence of God viewed in the Light of Holy Scripture. 8vo. pp. 406. *Lond.*
Another ed., 1866. A Wesleyan.

——— **Brownson** (Orestes A.) The Punishment of the Reprobate.
Not in the Brit. Mus.
The author was a native of Windsor County, Vermont. He was in succession, a Presbyterian minister, a Universalist, a Deist, again a Christian minister, and finally a Roman catholic. He was a great admirer of the philosophy of Comté, as developed in the Cours de Philosophie Positive. A notice of the author's literary character will be found in Griswold's Prose Writers of America.

——— **Walker** (J. B.) The Philosophy of the Divine Operation in the Redemption of Man. 8vo. *Lond.*
This is a second volume of the author's "Philosophy of the plan of salvation," 1845, 12mo.

——— **Smith** (John) Letters to his brother the Rev. Peter Smith.
16mo. *Philad.* (*U.S.*)
A Presbyterian Calvinist Minister to a Methodist Preacher.

[1862.] Assurance of Salvation. Gael.
12mo. *Edinb.*

[1862.] **Bartle** (George W.) A Dissertation on the nature and extent of the Sacrifice of Christ. 2nd ed.
London, Liverpool [*printed.*]

——— **Baxter** (Robert) Prophecy the Key of Providence. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Cunningham** (Will., *D.D.*) The Reformers, and the Theology of the Reformation. 8vo. *Edinb.*

1863. **Luthardt** (C. E.) Die Lehre vom freien Willen, &c. *Leipz.*

——— **Whateley** (Rich.) Perseverance and Assurance. 8vo. *Dubl.*
This is a reprint from the "Essays on some of the difficulties in the writings of St. Paul," see 1828.

——— **Bouvier** (Théophile) Etude critique sur le Jansénisme.
8vo. *Strasbourg.*

——— **Steward** (Geo.) Mediatorial Sovereignty. 2 vols. 8vo. *Edin. & Lond.*

——— **Cunningham** (William, *D.D.*) Historical Theology, a review of the principal Doctrinal discussions since the Apostolic Age. 2 vols. 8vo. *Edin.*
see p. 112.

——— **Gibson** (James, *D.D.*) Present Truths in Theology, Man's Inability and God's Sovereignty in "The Things of God," in their relation to Gospel Doctrine and Moral Resposibility.
2 vols. 8vo. *Glasgow.*
The author was Professor of Free Church Coll., Glasgow.

——— **Klein** (J.) De Jansenismi origine, doctrina, historia. pp. 143. *Breslau.*

——— **Prichard** (Richard) Parhad y Saint (a Treatise on the Perseverance of the Saints.) 16mo. pp. 190. *Bangor.*
The author was a Wesleyan.

——— **Birks** (T. R.) The Ways of God; or Thoughts on the Difficulties of Belief in Providence and Redemption.
8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Stanley** (Arthur Penrhyn, *D.D.*) Human Corruption. A Serm. 8vo.
The author was Dean of Westminster.

——— **Synge** (Alex. Hen.) Triumphs of Grace. 8vo. *Lond. (Ipswich printed.)*
Author of "Law and Grace," *Ipswich*, 1862, 8vo.

——— **Thomas** (David, *D.D.*) Resurrections, Thoughts on Duty and Destiny.
8vo.
The author was a Dissenter.

——— **Antliff** (Wm.) The Foreknowledge of God. A Paper.
2nd ed. 12mo. *Lond.*
Only this ed. in Brit. Mus.

——— **Schluenkes** (F.) Das Wesen der Erbsünde nach dem concilium von Trient unter.....Berücksichtigung der ... ..h. h. A. Thomas von Aquin, *etc.*
8vo.

1863. **Tepe** (Geo.) and **Opzoomer** (C. W.) Over Vrijheid en ouvrijheid van het Willen van den Mensch.
pp. 51. 8vo. *Utrecht.*

1864. **Pressense** (E. de) The Redeemer. post 8vo.

——— **Collier** (Z.) Free Grace.
16mo. *Lond.*

——— **Dewey** (Orville) Lowell Lectures. The Problem of Human Destiny; or the End of Providence in the world and man. 8vo. *New York.*
5th ed., *New York*, 1866, pp. vii, 280, 8vo.

——— **Fry** (Edw.) The Doctrine of Election. An Essay. pp. 191. 8vo. *London.*
The Author is the present Lord Justice Fry. The Essay is learned, orthodox, and catholic. One of the best, if not the best, contributions of modern times to the literature of the subject.

——— **Smithson** (J. H.) Tracts, Theological. 12mo. *Manchester.*
One on the Scripture doctrine of redemption, and another on Freewill of man and Origin of Evil, illustrating the doctrines of Swedenborg.

——— **Campion** (Will. M.) Nature and Grace. 21 sermons at Whitehall, 1862 and 4. 8vo. *Cambridge.*

——— **Williams** (Owens) Rhyddid yr Wyllys [The Liberty of the Will].
8vo. pp. 191. *Bangor.*
Not in the Brit. Mus.
The author was a Wesleyan.

——— **Whedon** (Daniel D., *D.D.*) Freedom of the Will as a basis of Human Responsibility. 8vo. pp. 438.
New York.
3rd ed. 1864, cr. 8vo, see Bibl. Rep. and Princ. Rev. Whedon and Hazard on the Will correction (by Stanley Matthews), Amer. Presby. and Theol. Rev., Jan. 1865 (by Prof. H. B. Smith, *D.D.*).

——— **D'Aubigne** (J. H.) Calvin Teaching. An address. *Lond.*

——— Inquiry into the causes of moral evil. *Lond.*

——— **Stewart** (Alex.) The Tree of Promise, or the Mosaic Economy a dispensation of the Covenant of Grace.
8vo. [*Edinb. printed*] *Lond.*

——— **Hazard** (Rowland G.) Freedom of Mind in Willing; or Every Being that wills a creative First Cause. pp. xviii, 455. 8vo. *N. York.*
Another ed. 1865. Also author of Letters on Causation and Freedom in Willing, *Boston*, [*U.S.*] 1869, pp. 300, 12mo.

——— **Ramsay** (Dean E. B.) Christian Responsibility. 12mo. *Edinb.*

——— **Beecher** (Chas.) Redeemer and Redeemed, an Investigation of the Atonement, etc. pp. 369.
8vo. *Boston* [*U.S.*]

——— Epsilon. The Moral Government of God. 8vo.

1865. **Schrader** (C.) Theses Theol.
4to. *Vind.*
1 De Prædestinatione.
2. De gratia actuali.

——— **Cranbrook** (J.) Divine Providence in relation to Prayer and Plagues.
8vo

——— **Paterson** (Alexander Smith, *DD.*) The Redeemer and the Redemption.
pp. 199

——— **Margerie** (Amed. de) Theodicée, Etudes sur Dieu, la création et la Providence. 2 vols. 8vo.

——— **Travis** (Henry, *M.D.*) Moral Freedom reconciled with Causation, by the Analysis of the Process of Self Determination. pp. 184. 8vo. *Lond.*
The work is worth perusal. Original and good so far as it goes, but the author fails to sufficiently recognise or allow for the operations of the Spirit of God, or His influence and work upon the spirits of men.

——— [**Sitwell** (Francis)] God's purpose in Creation and Redemption.
pp. 356. 8vo. *Edinb.*
5 editions.

——— **Alford** (Henry) Meditations in Advent, on Creation and on Providence.
8vo. *Lond.*

——— The Missing Doctrine in Popular Preaching. 8vo. *Lond.*
p. 65. Election and Predestination. Sound and practical.

——— **Bonifas** (F.) La Doctrine de la Rédemption dans Schleiermacher.
8vo. *Paris.*
Printed at Toulouse. Bonifas also wrote "Etude sur la Theodicée de Leibnitz."—*Paris*, 1863, 8vo.

——— **Chalmers** (Thos.) The Reign of grace. 16mo. *Lond.*

——— **Maurice** (John F. D.) The Conflict of good and evil in our day.
8vo. *Lond.*
Letter 6. On Freewill.

——— **Hockin** (T.) Assurance. 8vo

1866. **Wyatt** (John) The Redemption of the World. 8vo. *Manchester.*

——— **Bardsley** (Jas.) Original sin and the effect of Adam's fall on man's position and character. 8vo

——— **Baldey** (Fred.) Free Grace and its Fruits. A Sermon. 8vo. *Portsmouth.*

——— **Benson** (Rich. Meux) The Free Action of God's love amidst the fixed operations of His power. A Sermon.
8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Blomfield** (Geo. Becher) Divine Providence in its relation to the cattle plague and prayer. 8vo. *Lond.*
Printed at Chester.

——— **Fenelon.** Traité de l'Existence de Dieu, et de ses Attributes.
Many earlier ed., 1 in 1720, 12mo.

——— **Monsell** (R. W.) The Religion of Redemption. pp. 564. 8vo. *Lond.*

1866. **Claughton** (Thos. Legh.) God's Providences and Judgments. A Serm. 8vo. *Lond.*

The author was successively Bp. of Rochester and St. Albans.

[1866]. The Whispers of providence. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Gary** (A.) Exposition critique des opinions de St. Augustin, sur la nature et l'origine du péché, etc. 8vo

——— **Moore** (Dan.) Prayer and Providence. Two Sermons. 4th ed.

——— The origin of evil—Rise and Fall. *N. York.*

——— **Robinson** (Stuart) Discourses of Redemption, etc. 8vo. *N. York.*

2nd ed., *Edinb.*, 1869, 8vo. The author was a Presbyterian and Prof. of Ch. Government and Pastorale Theology at Danville, Kentuckey.

——— **Alexander** (P. P.) Mill and Carlyle. An examination of J. S. Mill's Doctrine of Causation in relation to Moral Freedom. 8vo

Another ed., *Edinb.*, 1875, pp. 261, 8vo. A most valuable criticism of Mr. Mill's idea of Freedom.

——— **Shepheard** (H.) The Tree of Life; or Redemption and its Fruits in Grace and Glory. 8vo

1867. **Rœhrich** (Th. E.) La doctrine de la prédestination et l'école de Saumur. *Strasb.*

——— **St. Vincent de Paul.** The Fall of Man and Redemption.

——— **Wallace** (Hen.) Representative Responsibility, a Law of the Divine Procedure in providence and redemption. 8vo. *Edinb.*

The author was a Presb. Minister of Londonderry.

——— **Hughes** (T.) The human will, its functions and freedom. pp. 390. 8vo. *Lond.*

A very able and valuable treatise, well worth careful study.

——— **Barkworth** (Shadwell M.) Grace, and the knowledge of Jesus Christ. 8vo. *Lond.*

Printed at Reading. Also author of "The accepted Substitute," a serm., *Reading*, 1866, 8vo.

——— **Cooke** (C. W. R.) On Man's Responsibility. An Essay. 8vo. *Cambridge.*

——— **Forbes** (A. P.) Explanation of the 39 Articles. 2 vols. 8vo.

Articles X & XVII.

——— **Haas** (C.) Natur und Gnade. 8vo. *Tübingen.*

[1867.] **D[arby]** (J. N.) Grace the Power of unity and of gathering. 8vo. *Lond.*

1867. **Gourg** (John) The Catholic doctrine of election. A serm. 8vo. *Chester* [*printed Lond.*]

1867 **Wellcome** (J. C.) and **Goud** (Clarkson) The plan of Redemption by our L. J. C. carefully examined and argued. 8vo. *Boston* (*U.S.*)

——— **Drobisch** (M. W.) Die Moralische Statistik und die menschliche Willens freiheit. 8vo. *Leipzig.*

1868. **Ryle** (John Charles) Your Election! A Tract for the Times. pp. 22. 12mo. *Lond.*

Also author of a Tract on "Final Perseverance." Present Bishop of Liverpool.

——— **Scott** (T.) A Series of Tracts. *London.*

Vol 2, Original sin, pp. iii, 21; Redemption.... and Grace, pp. 50.

Vol 5, On Moral evil; a letter from a Friend [*i.e.* Chas. Voysey] pp. 30.

Vol 9, Thoughts as to the existence of evil. By Prof. F. W. Newman, pp. 10.

Vol 13, Human Depravity. By the Rev. James Cranbrook, pp. 16.

Vol 15, Grace, 1876, pp. 20.

——— **Moister** (William) Stories illustrative of the providence and grace of God in connection with the Missionary Enterprise. 8vo. pp. 416. *Lond.*

The author was a Wesleyan, and wrote also "Death averted, or Divine Providence illustrated in the deliverance of a Missionary," s. D., 18mo, pp. 34.

——— Free will and divine decree.

——— **Travis** (H.) Free will and law in perfect harmony. *Lond.*

——— **Taylor** (William) The election of grace. pp. 247. 8vo. *Lond.*

By an American Minister.

——— The Creation, Fall of man, and other poems. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— Redemption, Imputation, Substitution, Forgiveness of sins and Grace. A Tract. *Ramsgate.*

——— Original sin. A Tract. *Ramsgate.*

——— **[Cardale** (John Bates)] The Church in this dispensation an Election. pp. 8. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— & 70. **Bunsen** (C. J.) God in History. 3 vols. 8vo. *Lond.*

(Providence.

——— **Pritchard** (C.) Analogies in the Progress of Nature and Grace. 8vo. *Camb.*

——— **Farrar** (F. W.) The fall of man, and other sermons. 8vo. *Lond.*

Another ed., *Lond.*, 1871, 12mo.

——— **Adams** (Wm., *D.D.*) The Three Gardens, Eden, Gethsemane and Paradise, or Man's Ruin, Redemption and Restoration. 12mo. *N. York.*

——— **Boecker** (P. J.) De Statu Justitiæ originalis ac de peccato originali quæ disserit S. Thomas Aquinas, collegit disposuit notisque illustravit P. J. B. 8vo. *Coloniæ* [*printed*] *and Novesii.*

1868. **Bushnell** (Horace) Moral uses of Dark Things. 8vo. *N. York.*
Other ed., *Lond.*, *Edinb.* [*printed*] 1869, 8vo; *N. York*, 1876, pp. 360, 12mo.

——— **Cock** (H. de) Is de Leer der absolute predestinatie intgangspunt of resultat van de leer der Gereformeerde Kerk ?.....Redevoering, etc. 8vo. *Kampen.*
Also author of, same year & place, 8vo, 'Nieuwe eereguil voor de Dordsche synode,' etc.

[1868.] **Watts** (Chas.) The Christian Scheme of Redemption. A Lect. 8vo. [*Lond.*]
The author was the secretary of the National Secular Society.

——— **Wolanski** (Ludwik Fadensz) Die Lehre von der Willensfreiheit des Menschen vom theologischen und philosophischen Standpunkte. 8vo. *Münster.*

——— **Wood** (Joseph) The philosophy of the Fall of Man. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Champneys** (William Weldon) Work, for God works in you. A Serm. 8vo.

——— **Lloyd** (E. B.) The Freedom of the Will stated afresh. pp. 64. 8vo

1869. **Shann** (Thos.) The doctrine of election. pp. 205. 12mo. *Lond.*
The author was Vicar of Hampsthwaite, and a Calvinist. We cannot say anything favourable of the work.

——— **Baxter** (Rob.) God's purpose in Judgment considered, with special reference to the assertion of mercy or annihilation of the lost. 16mo. *Lond.*
Also author of 'The Victory of Divine Goodness,' 1869, 8vo, in reply to strictures on above book.

——— [**Rogge** (H. C.) en P. A. Tiele] Catalogus van HSS. op de Bibliotheck der Remonstr. Gereform. gemeente te Rotterdam. 8vo. *Amst.*

[1869.] [**Gregg** (T. H.)] Election and Reprobation. (Reprinted from 'Gilead') 16mo. *Lond* [*Weymouth printed.*]

1870. **Jungmann** (Bernardus) Tractatus de Gratia. 8vo. *Ratisb.*

——— Man next to God in his original status and final destiny. A plea for Redemption. 12mo. pp. xi. 241. *Lond.*

——— **Ferguson** (A.) Particular Redemption and the universal gospel offer. 12mo. *Edinb.*

[1870.] Assurance of Salvation. A Tract. 8vo. *Lond.*

1870. **Bersier** (Eugene) La Solidarité. 12th ed. 12mo. *Paris.*
Discourse on the doctrines of the Fall and the Redemption.

——— **Dunn** (Henry) What saith the Scriptures ? 8vo. *Lond.*
Contains an Essay on Election.

——— **Dupuy** (Paul) Du Libre Arbitre. 8vo. *Paris* [*Bordeaux printed.*]

1870. **Ward** (John) Pamphlet shewing that the doctrine of Original Sin has no foundation whatever in Scripture. 8vo. [*Birmingham*]

[1870.] **Wilberforce** (Sam., *D.D.*) Faith and Free Thoughts, edited by.
Contains "The Principle of Causation considered by Canon Mozley, *D.D.*" "The Philosophy of Human Responsibility," by Birks.

1871. **Newman** (F. W.) Divergence of Calvinism from Pauline Doctrine. pp. 10.

——— **Tideman** (J.) De stichting der Remonstrantche Broederschap, 1619—34. 2 vols. 8vo. *Amst.*

——— **Naville** (E.) Lectures on the Problem of evil, trans. by E. W. Thalders. 8vo. *Edinb.*
Another ed. trans. by J. P. Lacroix, *New York*, 1872, pp. 330, 12mo.

——— **Froude** (J. A.) Calvinism. An address delivered at St. Andrews, March 17th, 1871. 8vo. *Lond.*
Also same year, *N. York*, 12mo.

——— **Groser** (Thomas) Sermons. pp. 449. 8vo. *Lond.*
2nd Dis., The Redeemer. 2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1875, p. 454, 8vo.

——— **Flower** (J. W.) Adam's Disobedience.

——— **Alexander** (Wm.) Man fallen & redeemed. 12mo. *Lond.*
Also author of "The creation of man," a serm. He was Bp. of Derry and Raphoe.

——— **Barrett** (Thomas Squire) A new view of Causation. 8vo. *Lond.*
Another ed., *Lond.*, 1872, 12mo.

——— **Nash** (Albert) Perseverance and Apostacy; being an argument in proof of the Arminian doctrine on that subject. pp. 338. 12mo. *N. York.*

[1871.] **Warsfold** (John Napper) Salvation by grace, its fruits and obligations. A serm. 8vo. *Lond.*

1872. **Rutherford** (A. C.) Special unconditional grace vindicated. 12mo. *Lond.*

——— **Talbot** (C.) The mystery of the Jews as revealed by St. Paul on Rom. XI. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Macaulay** (Geo.) Puritan Theology, or Law, Grace, and Truth. 2 vols. 8vo. *Glasg.*

——— **Cowie** (Benjamin Morgan) The Voice of God. Chapters on Foreknowledge. 8vo. *Lond.*
Also author of 'Sacrifice, the Atonment,' etc., *Camb.*, 1856, 8vo. The author was Dean of Manchester, and subsequently of Exeter.

——— **Fouillee** (Alfred) La Liberté et de Determinisme. 8vo. *Paris.*

[1872.] **Wilkinson** (Will. Francis) Special Providence and Prayer. 16mo. *Lond.*
Also author of Testimony of Scripture and Reason to the doctrines of.....the atonement, etc., [*Derby printed*] *Lond.*, 1866, 12mo. Another ed., *Lond.*, 1867, 8vo.

1873. God's way of electing souls. Glad tidings for every one. 12mo. *Lond.*

[1873.] **Bell** (Richard) Ruth; or lessons on character and providence. 8vo. *Plymouth.*

1873. **Nelson** (David, *M.D.*) The Being and Attributes of the God-head as evinced in creation. 8vo

[1874.] **W[ilkinson]** (E[dward]) On the Duty of Preaching God's predestination, by St. Augustine. 8vo

In Snargate Free Grace Tracts, No. 3.

[1874.] **Washburn** (E. A.) Moral Responsibility and Physical Law. A serm. 8vo

In Christian Truth and Modern Opinion, etc.

1874. **Luthardt** (Chr. Ernst.) Gnade und Wahrheit. Predigten. 8vo. *Leipsiz.*

——— **Alexander** (Will. Lindsay) Assurance of Faith and Assurance of Salvation. A Discourse. 8vo. *Edinb.*

——— **Worter.** Der Pelagianismus. *Freiburg.*

1875. **Calvert** (Geo.) Redemption. A poem. 2nd ed. 2 vols. 8vo. *Huddersfield.*

——— **Clase** (John Mitchell) The dark side of Wesleyanism, and gratitude for Divine Election. 8vo. *Plymouth.*

——— **Brodie** (Jas.) Science and Scripture, or the Work of Redemption in relation to the Universe. 8vo. *Edinb.*

——— **James** (Will.) Grace for Grace; Letters of, with Introd. by D. L. Moody. 12mo.

Another ed., 1876, 12mo.

——— **Aikman** (Will. Robertson) Judgment of the Judge of Jehovah; or the rationalism of Ultra-Calvinism repudiated, &c. 8vo. *Lond.*

Printed at Guildford.

——— **Mackay** (W. P.) Grace and Truth under twelve aspects. pp. 272. 8vo. *Edinb.*

Many ed., one 1883, 12mo. A work of considerable merit and practical value. The author is a minister at Hull.

[1875.] **Hands** (Jos.) Dissertations on Will, and also Essays on Freewill. pp. 158. 8vo. *Lond.*

1876. **[Caird** (Will. R.)] God's purpose with mankind and the earth. 2nd ed. 8vo. *Melbourne.*

Treats with ability and soundness, the Fall, Freedom, and Responsibility, Redemption, &c. The 1st ed. of Part I, was 1873. The work is in three parts.

——— **Boys** (Thos.) The Trinity of Man, shewing the consistency of free will with the grace of God. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Phillips.** Remarkable Providences. *Lond.*

——— **Schill** (A.) D. Constitution Unigenitus; ihre Veranlassung u ihre Folgen E. Beitrag. z. Geschichte d. Jansenismus. 8vo. *Freib.*

1876. **Gasparin** (Comte de) Pensées de liberté. 12mo. *Paris.*

——— **Tullock** (John) The Christian doctrine of Sin. 8vo.

——— **Altdorfer** (Albrecht) The Fall of Man and his Redemption through Christ. 8vo. *Holbein Society.*

[1876.] **Mell** (P. H.) The doctrine of Prayer; its utility and its relation to Providence. 12mo. *New York.*

1876. **Stewart** (James G.) Freedom of the Will vindicated. 8vo. *Glasgow.*

Refutation of Edwards.

1877. **Kelber** (H.) Institutiones Theologicæ de Gratia Merito et Justificatione. *Lovanii.*

——— **Guthrie** (Malcolm) The Causational and Free Will Theories of Volition, a review of Dr. Carpenter's Mental Physiology. 8vo. *Lond.* [*Liverpool printed.*]

——— **Conta** (B.) Théorie du fatalisme (Essai de philosophie matérialiste.) 18mo. *Bruxelles.*

——— **M'Ewan** (Thos.) Book of Esther, illustrative of Character and Providence. pp. 220. 12mo. *Edinb.*

——— **Lindsay** (Hon. Colin) De Ecclesia et Cathedra. 2 vols.

Book II, The Creation of Man, the Fall, &c.—Book III, The Divine Plan.

[1877.] **Wood** (Alfred Maitland) Are the pain and sorrow in the world inconsistent with a belief in God's power and goodness?.....Are the best feelings of humanity inconsistent with a belief in the atonement made for sin by Jesus Christ? 8vo.

1878. **Forbes** (John, *D.D.*, *LL.D.*) Predestination and Freewill, and the Westminster Confession of Faith, with Explanation of Rom. ix. pp. 116. 8vo. *Edinb.*

This was originally pub. at the end of the author's Analytical Commentary on the Romans, *Edin.*, 1868, 8vo. The work is Calvinistic, but with important modification—more the views of Dr. Payne. The author was Prof. of Oriental Languages, Aberdeen.

——— Providence of God illustrated. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Edge** (Will. John) Thoughts on the particular and providential care of God. A Serm. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Hurter** (H.) Theologiæ dogmaticæ compendium in usum studiosorum theologiæ. 8vo. *Ebd.*

Vol 3, De gratia.

——— **Janet** (Paul) Final Causes. Trans. from the French by Will. Affleck, B.D. pp. 508. 8vo. *Edinb.*

(Divine government.)

1878. **Long** (H. A.) Calvinism popularized. p. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **[Norton** (Rob.)] Primary Truths of Christianity. pp. 202. 8vo. *Lond.*
p. 94, Redemption.

[1878.] **Bagot** (Daniel, *D.D.*) The Grace of Christ. 16mo. *Lond.*
The author was Dean of Dromore, and Vicar of Newry. He also wrote an Exposition of the 1st 17 chapters of St. Matthew, 8vo, p. 332, which contains a Treatise on the Atonement; and also wrote on "The Atonement," 1860, 8vo.

1879. **Copner** (James) The Veil Removed; Essays on Creation by Evolution, The Fall, &c.
pp. viii., 326, 8vo. *Lond.*
The author was Vicar of Elston.

——— The Teaching of St. Augustine and Hooker respecting the Divine Will. 8vo.

——— **Caussade** (Jean Pierre) The Workings of the Divine Will. From the French. 16mo.
2nd ed., *Lond.*, 1881, pp. 109, 16mo.

1880. **Jameson** (G.) Foreknowledge and Predestination with relative difficulties. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Bright** (William) Select Anti-Pelagian Treatises. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Allen** (Jos. Hen.) Three phases of modern theology, Calvinism, Unitarianism, Liberalism.
pp. 70. 8vo. *Boston* (*U.S.*)

——— **Buechner** (F. C. C. L.) The influence of heredity on Free Will. Translated by Annie Besant.
pp. 14. 8vo. *Lond.*
Mrs. Besant also wrote on "The Atonement" [1874], *Lond.*, 8vo, printed at Edinburgh.

——— **McCosh** (James) Typical forms and special ends in Creation. New ed.
pp. viii, 539. 8vo. *New York.*

——— **Cooper** (J.) The province of law in the fall and recovery of man.
pp. xlviii, 244. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Wallace** (Robert) The doctrines of Predestination, Reprobation, and Election. pp. viii, 190. 12mo.
The author was Pastor of Cathcart Road, E. V. Church, Glasgow.

——— **Brown** (Alex.) The doctrine of sin. pp. 205. 8vo. *Glasgow.*

——— **Cox** (Sam.) The Genesis of evil, and other Serm.
pp. xvi, 351. 8vo. *Lond.*
Another ed., 1883, 12mo.

——— **Shedd** (W. G. T., *D.D.*) A Critical and Doctrinal Commentary on the Romans. pp. vii, 439. 8vo. *New York.*

——— Triumphs of Divine Grace.
pp. 62. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Segur** (Monsignore de) Three Roses of the Elect. 12th ed., translated from the French.
pp. 156. 8vo. *Dublin.*

1880. **Medwin** (A.) The Existence of Evil; considered in its relation to Divine Sovereignty. pp. 96. 8vo. *Lond.*

——— **Duguld** (Alex.) Nature and the Object of Evil. A Discourse.
pp. 14. 8vo.

——— The Ninth chapter of the Romans.
pp. 16. 8vo. *Lond.*

1881. **Schneemann** (G.) Controversiarum de divinæ gratiæ liberique arbitrii concordia, &c. pp. 491. 8vo. *Freiburg.*
The author was a Jesuit. A very able and valuable history of the controversy.

——— **Hughes** (H.) Redemption of the World. 8vo.

——— **Ward** (Will. Geo.) Science, prayer freewill and miracles. An Essay.
pp. vi, 59. 8vo. *Lond.*
Reprinted from the "Dublin Review," of April, 1867.

——— **Woodroffe** (J. J.) Grace sufficient. A Sermon. pp. 11. 12mo. *Dub.*

[1881.] **Sears** (Edm. H.) Regeneration.
pp. 179. 12mo. *Manchester.*
A Swedenborgian publication, treating of hereditary corruption and original sin.

——— **Taylor** (W.) Freedom of the Will. 12mo.

——— Philosophy of the Plan of Salvation.

——— **Gordon** (A. J.) Grace and Glory. Sermons. pp. 355. 12mo. *Boston* (*U.S.*)

——— **Swedenborg** (E.) Creation, Incarnation, Redemption, and the Divine Trinity. pp. 256. 16mo. *Philadel.*

——— **Macpherson** (John) The Westminster Confession of Faith.

——— **Patton** (John M.) The Death of Death; or a Study of God's holiness in connection with the Existence of Evil, in so far as intelligent and responsible Beings are concerned. By an Orthodox Layman. pp. 277. 8vo.

1882. The Perfect Way: or the Finding of Christ, Nine Lectures on the Fall, Redemption, &c. 4to.

——— **[Jarvie** (Alex.)] Truths for all People. 8vo. *Lond.*
p. 1, Redemption; p. 137, Grace and Hope.

——— **Klassen** (F.) Die innere Entwickelung des Pelagianismus. *Freiburg.*

1884. **Jamieson** (Geo.) Profound Problems in Theology and Philosophy. 8vo.
Contains Nature and Origin of Evil, Divine Decrees, The Problem of Freewill, &c. Learned, sound and of exceptional value. The author supports the Calvinistic scheme to a certain extent, but does not go even so far as the Westminster Confession of Faith in some parts. He rests predestination on foreknowledge, not exactly in the Arminian sense of foresight of faith, or of good works, but of "sense of, and sorrow for sin, by the operations of His restraining grace in proclaiming the terror of God on sinners." Those brought to this condition God predestinates to be conformed to Jesus Christ in His death and His life. The real difficulty is certainly not met, nor the "profound

problem" solved, but Calvinistic election as resting on the Divine Sovereignty *alone* is repudiated. Whatever views may be held, no one can peruse this volume without instruction and interest.

1884. **Lindesie** (A.) The Gospel of Grace. 8vo.

1885. **Wilson** (John M.) Nature, Man, and God. A contribution to the Scientific teaching of to-day. 8vo. *Lond.*
Contains a chapter on Providence.

——— **Clarke** (Hen. J.) The Fundamental Science. 8vo.
The fundamental will.

1886. **Cazenove** (John G.) Historical aspects of the *à priori* argument concerning the Being and Attributes of God. 8vo.

1886. **Wall** (Geo.) Good and Evil in their relation to the Dispensations of Providence. pp. 64. 8vo. *Lond.*
An excellent little book with some original thoughts, but unfortunately unsound on the extent and far-reaching effects of the Fall. The author, too, has some fanciful ideas respecting the nature of angels and their trial.

1888. **Ott** (A.) Le Problème du mal. 8vo. *Paris.*

1889. **Liddon** (Canon) Sermon at St. Paul's, on "The Providence of God," 30 Dec., 1888.
Reported in "Church Times," 4 Jan., 1889.

ADDENDA.

[1519.] **Carolstadt** (A. B. de) Pro Div-Divinæ Gratiæ defensione. 4to. *Witteb.*

1525. **Columna** (Æg.) De Prædestinatione, Præscientia, de peccato origin. 4to. *Neap.*

1645. **Stengel** (Geo.) Sapient. Dei mundum regentis gubernatio in casu, fortuna, fato. pp. 238. *Ingolst.*
The author was a Jesuit, but the work is not mentioned by De Backer.

1648. **Fuller** (Thos.) Serm. on Assurance.

1650. **Eltzen** (Conr. Frid. von) *Resp.* De termino vitæ humanæ disputatio. 4to.

1652. **Troughton** (W.) Scripture Redemption restrayned and limitted. 12mo.

[1683.] **Arrhemius** (Claudius) De Fortuna. 4to.

1691. **Cinccius** (J. G.) *Resp.* De termino vitæ humanæ disputatio. 8vo.

[1700.] Dissertatio de termino vitæ an prolongari vel abbreviari possit? 4to.

1701. **Willemer** (J. H.) De Imagine Dei ad Genesim i, 26. Fol.

1713. The Hist. of Paradise, a Discourse on the State of Innocence and the Fall of Man, by a Presbyt. of the Church of England. 12mo.

1726. An Inquiry into the Origin of the Ideas of Beauty and Virtue. 2nd ed. 8vo. *Lond.*
(Concerning moral good and evil).

1733. **Fancourt** (F.) Free Agency of accountable creatures maintained. 8vo. *Lond.*

1737. **Wolfius** (J.) Dissertatio de essentia animæ humanæ ejusque libertate. 8vo.

1805. **Woodward** (Park) The Triumph of Faith. 12mo. *Lond.*
Dialogues between Christian and Calvin on 12 doctrinal heads.

The Liberty of the human Will, or Salvation attainable by all within the sound of the Gospel. pp. 69. 8vo. *Lond.*

NO DATES.

Fearn on Universal Redemption.

Gouet, Apologia Thomistarum, seu Calvinismi et Jansenismi defensio.

Henry's Leben Calvin's.

Harrison (W.) The Purchase of Grace—Rules to discover the Gold of True Grace, &c. 8vo.

Lord's Literary Theol. Review. Vol 6, 337.

Lindsay on Universal love and grace.

Matthews (John, *D.D.*) The Divine purpose displayed in the Works of Providence and Grace. 8vo. *Philad.*

Manser on Election and Predestination.

Mell on Predestination and Perseverance.

Mœbius de Gratia irresistib. Diss. XIX.

Paige (W.) Perseverance of the Saints. 12mo. *Lond.*

Pinterellus (Franc.) Origo Jensenismi detecta.

Rose (John Baptist) Traité sur la Providence.

Schiller (Jac.) De Amissione Gratiæ et statu Peccati.

Secerius (Joh.) Libellus de animæ præparatione in extremo laborantibus deque Prædestinatione et Sentatione Fidei. 4to. *Hagena.*

Sybite (P. A) De libre arbitre.

Index Nominum.

A. (S.) 1787
Abarca (P. de) [1693]
Abarbenel (D. I.) 1644
Abbadie (J.) 1723
Abbot (G.) 1598
Abbot (R.) 1616, 1618
Abelli (L.) 1705
Abillon, *see* D'Abillon
Abraham (R.) 1596
Academicus, 1802
Accarigi (J.) 1641
Acindynus (G.) 1734
Acosta (I.) 1666
Acton (S.) 1741
Actorie, 1852
Adam (J.) 1650, 1654
Adam (R.) 1809
Adams (G.) 1752
Adams (J.) 1805
Adams (N.) 1849
Adams (R.) 1736
Adams (W.) 1716, 1868
Adamson (J.) 1768
Adrianus, 1471
Ady (J.) 1807
Ægidius, 1479
Ævolus (C.) 1580
Affelmannus (J.) 1615, 1674, 1706
Agnostos [1788] 1825
Agricoleus (F.) 1615
Agrippa (H. C.) [1535]
Aickin (J.) 1705
Aikman (W. R.) 1875
Ainsworth (H.) 1642
Airenti (G. V.) 1805
Aitken (R.) 1854
Alardus (F.) 1541
Albanus (Æ.) 1711
Albertus (A.) 1507, 1623
Albertus (M.) 1651
Albiz (M. de) 1632
Albo (J.) 1612
Alcott (J.) 1794
Alderete (B. de) 1662
Ales de Corbet (P. A. de) 1758
Alexander, 1536
Alexander (N.) 1748
Alexander (P. P.) 1866
[Alexander (S.)] 1814
Alexander (W.) 1871
Alexander (W. L.) 1874
Alford (H.) 1835, 1842, 1850 1865
Alford (J.) 1644
Algerus, 1721
Alister (R.) 1854
Allacci (L.) 1645
Allan (R.) 1846
Alleine (R.) 1663, 1666
Allen (G.) 1829
Allen (Jas.) 1727
Allen (Jo.) 1769 [1800]
Allen (Jos.) 1751
Allen (Jos. H.) 1880
Allen (R.) [1648] 1847
Allen (T.) [1783]
Allen (W.) 1679, 1845
Allies (T. W.) 1844
Allinga (P.) 1790
Allut (J.) 1714
[Alsop (V.)] 1678
Alstedius (J. H.) 1616
Altdorfer (A.) 1876
Alticozzi (L.) 1744
Alting (H.) 1646, 1647
Alting (J.) 1687
Alvarez (D. de) 1610,1622,1629
Amandus (J. de S.) 1534
Amat de Gravenson (I. H.) 1737
Ambrose (Saint) *see* 1561
Amelote (D.) 1660
Ames, or Amesius (Gul.) 1613, 1615, 1617, 1618, 1629, 1634
Amicus, 1802
Amicus (F.) 1640
Amling (W.) 1598
Ammon (C. F.) 1820
Amory (T.) 1746, 1766
[Amour] 1646, 1662
Amsdorff (N.) 1564
Amulo, 1640, 1765, 1779
Amyraut (M.) 1634,1641, 16 , 1645, 1646, 1647, 1648, 1658, 1660, 1667
Andala (R.) 1713
Anderson (D.) 1711
Anderson (J. S. M.) 1837, 1842
Anderson (M.) 1834
Andreæ (J.) 1574, 1575, 1577, 1581, 1584, 1585
Andreæ (Sam.) 1679
Andræ (Sim.) 1612
Andreæ (T.) 1603
Andrewes (L.) 1631, 1846
Andrews (E.) 1821
Andrews (J.) 1763
Andrianus, 1471
Andros (T.) 1821
Ange de la Passion, 1715 (*printed in error Dorge*)
Anglus (T.) 1652, 1659
Annat (F.) 1632, 1645, 1650, 1651, 1652, 1653,1654,[1660] 1664, [1665], 1666, 1668
Annesley (S.) 1660
Anselm, 1491
Antliff (W.)[1863
Antonides (S.) 1645
Antonius (B.) 1480
Antonius (P.) 1702
Applanus (C.) 1496
Appleton (J.) [1797]
Appleton (N.) 1753
A[ppleyard] (E. S.) [1861]
Aquila, 1814
Aquilovicanus (M.) 1624
Aquinas (T.) 1570
Arandus, 1672
Arauda (F.) 1691, 1693
Araujo (J. de) 1734
Arbaldus (A.) 1639
Arbussus, 1689
Arbuthnot (J.) 1700
Archard, 1798
Archelaus, 1720
Archer (J.) 1801
Arcularius (D.) 1593
Aretius (B.) 1572
Arias (F.) 1605
Aristocles, 1746
Arius-Montanus (B.) 1593

Armand (J.) 1781
Arminius (J.) 1605, 1609, 1610, 1611, 1612, 1613, 1629, 1643, *see* 1724
Arms (H. P.) 1847
Arnauld (A.) 1644, 1645, 1650, 1651, 1652, [1653] 1654, 1656, 1657, 1662, 1664, 1671, 1672, 1685, 1686, 1700, 1715, *see* 1690
Arnesius (R.) 1560
Arnobius (A.) 1596
Arnold (F.) 1840
Arnold (T.) 1834
Arnoldus (N.) [1654]
Arnoldus (P.) 1606
Arpe (P. F.) 1712
Arrhemus (C.) *Addenda* [1683]
Arriaga (R. de) 1644
Arthur (M.) 1790
Artomedes (S.) 1609
Artopæus (R. T.) 1655
Ashton (T.) 1770
Aslacus (C.) [1612]
Assum (J.) 1592 [1623]
Atkey (A.) 1733
Atkins (M.) 1842
Atkinson [1778]
Atkinson (C.) 1774
Atkinson (J.) 1708, 1709
Atkinson (P. R.) 1857
Atterbury (L.) 1743
Atthill (L.) 1827
Aubuz (C. D') 1648
Audin (M.) 1843
Augustin de Herrera, 1675
Augustine (A.) 1467, 1524, 1527, 1528, 1538, 1550, 1611, 1613, 1616, 1643, 1644, 1647, 1649, 1679, 1701
Augustinus (T.) 1653
Aurelius (Eps.) 1524
Aurefaber (J.)
Autumnus (G.) 1565
Auvray le Sieur [*pseud. i.e.* Martin de Barcos], 1644
Avendano Eztenaga (M. de), 1674
Avila (F. de) *see* D'Avila
Avila (J. R. de) 1591
Avitus (A. E.) 1510
Aylesbury (T.) 1659
Aylett (R.) 1622

B. (C.) 1815
B. (J.) 1754
[Baarle (K. von)] 1617, 1619, 1620
Babb (J.) 1824
Babbage (C.) 1837
Bacheler (T. H.) 1852
Backerus (J. L.) 1666
Backmann (C.) 1651
Backus (I.) 1771, 1789
Bacon (Lady A.) 1550
Bacon (R.) 1829
Badger (A.) 1837
Bagger (H.) 1691
Bagot (D.) [1878]
Bagot (J.) 1650, 1654
Bagshaw (G.) 1845
Bagshawe (E.) 1659, 1662
Bagusa (J.) [1624]
Bail (L.) 1653
Bailey (J.) [1806]
Baillie (A.) 1628
Baillie (J.) 1861
Baillie, or Bailie (R.) 1633, 1640, 1641
Bailly (L.) [1808]
Bain (A.) 1859
Baird (S. J.) 1860
Baius (M.) 1563, 1676
Baker (A.) 1847
Baker (T.) 1656
Baker (T. B.) 1834
Baker (W. R.) 1855
Bakewell (T.) 1644
Baldey (F.) 1866
Balduin (F.) 1562, 1564
Balduinus (F.) 1600, 1607
Baldwin (T.) 1804
Balfour (J.) 1782
Balguy (J.) 1730, 1741
Balingen, *see* Balinghem
Balinghem (A. De) 1626
Ball (J.) 1645
Ball (N.) 1745
Ballantyne (J.) 1853
Ballionius (L.) 1577, 1579
Bally (G.) 1758
Balmer (R.) 1845
Balthasar (H. C.) 1691
Baltzer (J. B.) 1831
Balzer (T.) 1663
Bange (G.) *see* [1735]
Bangs (N.) [1800]
Banks (J. W.) 1857
Barclay (R.) 1676
[Barcos (M. de)] 1645, 1650, 1666, 1696, 1719
Bardesanes, 1710
Bardsley (J.) 1866
Barickius (M.) 1619
Barker (J.) 1763
Barkworth (S. M.) 1867
Barlæus (C.) *see* Baarle
Barlee (W.) 1656, 1658
Barlow (J.) 1618
Barlow (T.) 1651
Barmann (K.) 1820
Barnard (S.) 1791
Barnes (A.) 1859
Barnes (John) 1807
Barnes (Jos.) 1669, 1833
Barnes (R.) *see* 1817
Barnes (T.) 1622
Barnett (N.) 1646
Baro (P.) [1588] 1590, 1613
Baronius (R.) 1685
Baronius (V.) 1666
Barovius (J. G.) 1686
Barret (J.) 1675
Barret (W.) 1631
Barrett (T. S.) 1871
Barrow (I.) 1828, 1830
Barrow (W.) 1821
Barry (J.) 1715
Bartholdus (G.) 1678
Bartle (G. W.) [1862]
Basadonna (J.) 1518
Baseley (I.) 1801
Basil (St.) *see* 1567
Basnage de Beauval (J.) 1709
Bate (J.) 1752, 1772
Bate (Jul.) 1745, 1750
Batelier (J.) 1642, 1664
Batelerius, *see* Batelier.
Bates (E.) 1793
Bates (W.) 1674
Batt (T.) 1643
Battini (C.) 1827
Battus (B.) 1605, 1620, 1625
Batty (A.) 1739
Beaumannus (M.) 1668
Baumgarten-Crusus (L. F. O.) 1827
Baumgartenus (S. J.) 1734, 1742, 1745
Baxter (Rich.) 1650, 1651, 1657, [1659], 1660, 1671, 1675, 1690, 1691, 1694
Baxter (Rob.) 1862, 1869
Bay (M. de) 1696
Bayes (T.) 1731
Baylæus (T.) 1626
Bayle (P.) 1682, 1685
Bayne (P.) 1618, 1619
Bayne (R.) 1860
Beach (J.) 1748
Beare (N.) 1710
Beaty (F.) [1802]
Beausobre (I. de) 1694
Beauvais (N. de) 1651
Beaven (T.) 1726
Bebelius (B.) 1664
Bebius (P.) 1664
Becanus (M.) 1604, 1606, 1608, 1609, 1610, 1611, 1613, 1614, 1619, 1657
Becerra (B. G.) 1737
Becher (R.) 1561
Bechmann (F.) 1667, 1680
Beck (C.) 1847
Becker (T.) 1689
Beckwith (J.) 1818
Beda (G.) *see* 1519
Beda (Ven.) 1563
Bedderkopff (G.) 1665
Bedford (A.) 1738
Bedford (T.) 1647
Beecher (C.) 1864
Beecher (E.) 1853
Beecher (L.) 1836
Beenius (J.) 1687
Behmens (J.) 1610
Behnius (E. L. F.) 1720
Behrend (J. F.) 1744
Bell (R.) [1873]
Bell (T.) 1814
Bell (W.) 1817
Bellamy (J.) 1811
Bellamy (Jos.) 1758, 1759

Bellarmine (Card. R.) 1591, 1615
[Bellelli (F.)] 1711, 1737
Belley (L'E. de) 1652
Belsham (T.) 1807, 1821, 1827
Benderus, 1598
Ben Israel (M.) 1642, 1709
Benefeild (S.) 1618
Benitiz de Lugo (C.) *see* Lugo
Benius (P.) [1596]
Benjumea (B. a) 1677
Bennet (J.) [1796]
Bennet (W.) 1812
Bennet (W. J. E) 1851
Benois, 1695
Benson (G.) 1737, 1748
Benson (J.) 1836
Benson (Jos.) [1780]
Benson (R. M.) 1861, 1866
Beresford (J.) 1818
Bereur (L.) 1634
Bergier (N. S.) 1771
Bergius (J.) [1622]
Berkeley (G.) 1713
Bernaldo de Quiros (A.) 1654
Bernard (St.) 1642
Bernard (J. F.) 1731
Bernard (Jon.) [1706]
Bernhardinus (T.) 1622
Bernhold (J. B.) 1737
Bernier (F.) 1685
Berriman (W.) 1733, 1751
Berrow (C.) 1746, 1766, 1772
Bersier (E.) 1870
Bersoe (E.) 1555
[Berti (J. L.)] 1737, 1747, 1750
Bertius (P.) 1609, 1610, 1611, 1612, 1614, 1615, 1616
Bertram, or Ratram, *see* 1677
Besant (A.) see Buechner
Besse (J.) 1755
Bethel (S.) 1691
Bevan (J. G.) 1807
Beveridge (W.) 1769
Beverland (H.) 1678
Beverley (T.) 1690, 1691, 1693, 1701
Beverovicius (J.) 1634
Bewicke (W.) 1760
Beyerlingk (L.) 1619
Beza (T.) 1556, 1578, 1581, 1582, 1583, 1590, 1592
Biagi (C.) 1770
[Biasichi (A.)] 1656
Bickersteth (R.) 1859
Biddulph (T. T.) 1824
Bidlake (J.) 1811
Bidwell (R.) 1657
Bieruma (J.) 1753
Bijonius (G.) 1683
Billingsley (J.) 1723
Bilson (T.) 1599
Bilstone (J.) 1756
Binchius (J.) 1660, 1664, 1666
Binet (E.) 1615, 1620
Binning (H.) 1839
Binsfeldius (P.) 1595
Birch (T.) 1749
Bircherod (J.) [1660] and *see* Mossinus
Bird (E.) 1726
Birks (T. R.) 1848, 1863 [1870]
Birt (I.) 1824
Birt (J.) 1813
Bisco (J.) 1658
Biscopius (I.) [1625]
Bishop (W.) 1823
Bize (V.) 1632
Black (F. G.) 1851
Blackburn (N.) [1807]
Blackmore (Sir R.) 1722
Blackwell (T.) 1710
Blair (A.) 1820
Blair (S.) 1840
Blake (T.) 1653, 1655
Blakes (J.) 1771
Blakey (R.) 1828 [1850]
Blanchodus (S.) 1635
Blanco (M.) 1746
Bland (P.) 1850
Bleby (H.) 1842, 1853
Bledsoe (A. T.) 1845, 1856
Blessensis (P.) 1600
Bligh (M.) 1765
Blomfield (C.) 1819
Blomfield (G. B.) 1866
Blood (B.) 1860
Blount (C.) 1693
Boardman (H. A.) 1839
Bobadilla (J.) [1587]
Bockshammer (G. F.) 1835
Bodecherus (N.) 1624
Bodius (H.) 1533
Boecker (P. J.) 1868
Boedick (C.) [1685]
Boehme (A. W.) 1711
Boehme (J.) 1655
Bogdanovitz (B.) 1697
Bogermannus (J.) 1614
Bois (Pet. du) 1661
Boissieu (A.) 1686
Bolsec (H. H.) 1577
Bolton (S.) 1643, 1645
Bomberger (J. H. A.) [1859]
Bonald (F.) 1610
Bonaventura (St. J.), [1497], 1588
Bond (R.) 1830
Bonicontrus (L.) 1529
Bonifas (F.) 1865
Bonlieu (Sr. de) 1651, *see* La Lane
Bonnières de Lousatre (J. de) 1699
Bononia (J. à) 1554
Bonsall (J. O.) 1830
Booth (A.) 1768
Borger (E. A.) 1817
Borgia (F. de) 1616
Bornatus (G.) 1571
Borojus (L.) 1607, 1610
Borrhaum (M.) *see* Chateillon
Borrull (M.) 1656, 1661
Bosc, *see* Du Bosc
Boscius (J.) 1671
Bossemius (M.) 1586
Bosses (B. des) 1719, 1726
Bossu (S. de) 1659
Bossuet (J. B.) 1697, 1731, 1772, *see* 1816
Boston (T.) 1771
Botomley (S.) 1806
Botsaccus (J.) 1664
Bott (T.) 1730
Boucher (R. P.) 1628
Boudon (G.) 1678
Boufflers (M. de) 1810
Bourdaloue (L.) 1776, 1806
Bourg (M. du) 1657, 1658
Bourgeois (J.) 1619
Bourn (S.) 1760
(*misprinted as Bowen*)
Bourzeis (L'Abbé de) 1649, 1650, 1652, 1662
Bouvier (T.) 1863
Bovillus (C.) 1529
Bowdler (T.) 1820
Bowles (C.) 1841
Bowles (W. L.) 1826
Boyel (J.) 1855
Boys (T.) 1876
Brackenbury (E.) 1806
Bradford (J.) 1562 [1798]
Bradley (C.) 1820
Bradley (S.) 1805
Bradwardin (T.) 1618
Braemer (G. C.) [1687]
Brahe (F.) 1602
Brais (S. de) 1678
Brake (C.) 1839
Bramhall (J.) 1655, 1656, 1658
Brancatus (L. C.) 1687
Brand (H.) 1615
Brandam (A.) 1834
Brandt (C.) 1724
Brandt (G.) 1671, 1708
Brandt (J.) 1625, 1705
Braun (G.) 1828
Bray (C.) 1841
Bray (T.) 1703
Brazer (J.) 1842
Breck (R.) 1784
Bregamus (R.) 1621
Breithauptus (J. J.) 1700
Brekell (J.) 1742
Brendel (J. C.) [1676]
Brennius (D.) 1666
Brereton (J.) 1844
Brest (J.) 1629
Bretschneider (K. G.) 1833
Brias (C. de) 1672
Bridge (W.) 1649, 1671
Bridges, 1737
Bridges (M.) 1825
Briegerus (J.) 1585
Bright (W.) 1880
Brinan (R.) 1641
Brinckhuys (C.) 1689
Brine (J.) [1734], 1736, 1743, 1746, 1750, 1752, 1754, 1762, 1813
Brinsley (J.) 1659

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

—:o:—

THE LAW OF COPYRIGHT in Works of Literature and Art, including that of the Drama, Music, Engraving, Sculpture, Painting, Photography, and Ornamental and Useful Designs, together with International and Foreign Copyright, 2nd edition, 8vo, 1881. 30s.

"A work which ought to be on the table of every author, artist, and publisher, of anyone in fact, whose possessions are in the domain of intellect."—*Art.*

"As our laws upon that subject at present stand, Mr. Copinger's work is a judicious, clear, and comprehensive arrangement and exposition of the different subjects included in the title page of his book.—*Athenæum.*

"We make no question that Mr. Copinger's well devised, well written, and useful treatise will become a standard work."—*Law Journal.*

"A work much needed, and which he has done exceedingly well."—*American Law Review.*

INDEX TO PRECEDENTS in Conveyancing and to Common and Commercial Forms, arranged in Alphabetical Order, with Subdivisions of an Analytical Nature, roy. 8vo, 1872. 28s.

"Mr. Copinger has not only designed an Index which cannot fail to be of practical use, but has successfully elaborated the work designed by combining a perspicuous order of arrangement with a most exhaustive table of contents, and most copious references to precedents."—*Law Journal.*

"In all public libraries the book should certainly have a place."—*Solicitors' Journal.*

TITLE DEEDS; their Custody, Inspection, and Production, at Law, in Equity, and in Matters of Conveyancing, including Covenants for the Production of Deeds and Attested Copies, 8vo, 1875. 14s.

"A really good treatise on the subject must be essential to the lawyer: and this is what we have here. Mr. Copinger has supplied a much-felt want."—*Law Journal.*

"Mr. Copinger has in his well written chapters, entered most fully and thoroughly into the special subject matter of his work, and has accordingly produced a book worthy of being used by every careful conveyancer."—*The Law.*

AN ESSAY on the Abolition of Capital Punishment: Embracing more particularly an enunciation and analysis of the principles of law as applicable to criminals of the highest degree of guilt, 8vo, 1876. 1s.

"The reasoning is exceedingly good, close, logical, accurate. He has grappled well with all the difficulties. Mr. Copinger may be congratulated on the production of an able essay that covers the whole subject of which it treats. This essay may be recommended as quite a storehouse of arguments . . . . bearing on every page proof of much diligent and copious research."—*Liverpool Mercury.*

"We can recommend Mr. Copinger's book as containing the fullest collection we have seen of facts and quotations from eminent jurists, statistics and general information bearing on the subject."—*Manchester Courier.*

"This is an able, logical, and massive essay. Reformers will read it with eager interest. Statesmen of all schools would do well to ponder its weighty and wise utterances."—*Oldham Chronicle.*

London: Stevens & Haynes, Bell Yard, Temple Bar.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

TABLES OF STAMP DUTIES from 1815 to the pres time, showing at a glance the *ad valorem* duties payable dur that period on Conveyances, Mortgages and Settlements, 8 1878. 2s. 6d.

London: Stevens & Haynes, Bell Yard, Temple Bar.

A TESTIMONY OF ANTIQUITY, shewing the Anci faith of the Church of England, touching the Sacrament of Body and Blood of Christ, with copious notes on the "I Presence," "The Sacrifice," "Wafer bread," "Mixed Chali "Prayers for the Dead," etc. 1s.

"Mr. Copinger's notes are sound and pointed."—*Church Times.*

"The notes are full of point and interest. An appendix deals effectively the question, 'Is the Holy Eucharist a Sacrifice?' We commend the pamphlet *Church Review.*

"This is a reprint of Elfric's celebrated homily, with learned, scholarly, fresh notes, by Mr. Copinger. The work is one of great theological value. It prove most interesting to Churchmen."—*Oldham Chronicle.*

London: B. M. Pickering, 196, Piccadilly, W.

THOUGHTS ON HOLINESS. Doctrinal and Practic 2s. 6d.

"The book is written in a spirit of earnest faith and deep piety."—*Lite Churchman.*

"Full of spiritual life and light, and should therefore be both instructive helpful to professing christians of all denominations. But that we know its a to be a practising barrister, we should have concluded that it was written by learned and saintly divine, so thoroughly is it impregnated with scriptural k ledge, divine theology, and the spirit of the holy living. Its tendency is to se highest privileges, responsibilities, and duties of the professing christian in lights and uncommon surroundings."—*Liverpool Mercury.*

"The writer has mastered his subject. It is a book which will not disappo —*The Churchman's Companion.*

"This neat little volume is an excellent aid to devotion. It is thoug earnest, experimental, unctuous. Its fervour and force, its depth and grasp, its suasiveness and impressiveness, are soon felt and enjoyed by the reader."—*Ol Chronicle.*

London: J. Masters & Co., 78, New Bond Street.

HISTORY OF THE COPINGERS, OR COPPINGERS. New Edition, royal 8vo. 30s.

Manchester: H. Sotheran & Co., 49, Cross Street.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE HYMNODY of the Chu Second and Enlarged Edition, small 4to. 1s.

Manchester: Forsyth Bros., 122 & 124, Deansgate.

T
o

of

juc
sub

use

La

I

T

A

w
fo

e

25125 234.90
C791
Copinger, W
AUTHOR
Treatise on predestination,
TITLE election, and grace
234.90 25125
C791